

(U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 29, ch. 4), to amend the Randolph-Sheppard Act (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 20, ch. 6A), to authorize grants-in-aid to the States for special programs for the blind and other severely disabled persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 276. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3199, a bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 5, 1949

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 2, 1949)

The Senate met, in executive session, in the former Supreme Court chamber in the Capitol at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, with grateful hearts stirred anew as a Nation of freemen has been celebrating the birthday of the state, we bow with reverence within the walls of this historic chamber saturated with national memories. We are vividly conscious this hallowed moment of invisible galleries filled with a cloud of witnesses from the heroic and creative past. These mellowed walls are vocal this hour. They speak to us of towering public servants, of legislators and judges, of momentous debates and decisions, of laws made and interpreted. These great figures of the yesterdays have entrusted to our hands the flaming torch of freedom once held by theirs. They admonish us that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Give us courage, give us vision, give us wisdom for the facing of these crucial days. May our America be the channel of Thy grace, helping to heal the open sores of this torn and tortured world. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 1, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, dis-

agreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. SMITH of Ohio were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2282) to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 287) extending section 1302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, until June 30, 1950, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2282) to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aiken | Hunt | Myers |
| Anderson | Ives | Neely |
| Bricker | Johnson, Colo. | O'Connor |
| Butler | Johnston, S. C. | O'Mahoney |
| Byrd | Kefauver | Pepper |
| Cain | Kem | Reed |
| Chapman | Kerr | Robertson |
| Chavez | Kilgore | Russell |
| Connally | Knowland | Schoeppel |
| Cordon | Langer | Smith, N. J. |
| Donnell | Long | Sparkman |
| Douglas | Lucas | Stennis |
| Downey | McCarran | Taft |
| Eaton | McCarthy | Thomas, Okla. |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Flanders | McFarland | Thye |
| Frear | McGrath | Tobey |
| Fulbright | McKellar | Tydings |
| Gillette | McMahon | Vandenberg |
| Graham | Malone | Watkins |
| Green | Miller | Wherry |
| Hayden | Millikin | Wiley |
| Hendrickson | Morse | Williams |
| Hickenlooper | Mundt | Withers |
| Hoey | Murray | |

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed an adviser to the delegation of the United States of America to the Second World Health Organization Assembly meeting at Rome, Italy.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Florida

[Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ARRANGEMENTS IN TEMPORARY SENATE CHAMBER

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before proceeding further, the Chair would like to have the Secretary read a statement on behalf of the Sergeant at Arms concerning the arrangements in the chamber the Senate is now occupying.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Because of limited space, the individual desks of all Senators could not be placed in this chamber. However, chairs are available for every Senator. Senators of the majority party are assigned chairs on the left of the chamber and those of the minority party are assigned chairs on the right. Except for the majority and minority leaders, no Senator has been assigned a desk or a particular chair, so Senators may sit wherever they choose on a "first come, first served" basis.

Senators will notice that two desks have been placed on each side of the chamber. These are to be used by Senators handling legislation and by those who desire to speak from prepared manuscripts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to say that it is obvious that the acoustics of this chamber are very excellent. From the standpoint of the Chair they are, because the Chair can hear even a whisper coming from any point in the chamber. Therefore the Chair suggests that conversation be kept to a minimum in order that order may be preserved.

May the Chair also say that he is happy to see so many Senators back after the holiday, on the first day's session in this historic chamber. The Chair hopes the Members of the Senate will not think him guilty of flattery when he says that he does not believe a finer-looking body of legislators has ever met here than that which is before him at this moment. [Applause.]

PHOTOGRAPHS OF SENATE SITTING IN OLD SUPREME COURT CHAMBER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement along the line of the statement prepared by the Sergeant at Arms. I sincerely hope the administrative assistants and all others who have business here with Senators will conduct their business with them expeditiously as possible, because we have little or no space for our secretaries or

those who have business with Senators in this chamber.

I should like also to make a unanimous-consent request. Four photographers would like very much to take pictures of the Senate at this time. It is my understanding that they will pool the pictures and distribute them throughout the country. As everyone knows, we have a very strict precedent in the Senate Chamber against any kind of photography. However, I am informed that photographs were taken when the Senate convened in this chamber in 1940. In view of the fact I thought perhaps there would be no objection upon the part of the Senators if we permitted the photographers to repeat the performance. I now ask unanimous consent that permission be granted to the photographers to make various pictures of the Senate while in session at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to say for the benefit of Senators that when the suggestion was first made by the able majority leader I objected. I felt that in keeping with the precedents of the Senate Chamber photographs should not be permitted, and that there might be further requests for pictures in the Senate Chamber proper when we return there. However, as the distinguished majority leader has said, in 1940 similar pictures were made in this chamber. This is not the Senate Chamber. Such pictures may give the people of the country some idea of the quarters in which this good-looking representation referred to by the distinguished Vice President is housed. We thank the Vice President for his reference.

Inasmuch as the taking of the pictures can be expedited and it can be completed in 4 or 5 minutes, I said I would withdraw the objection and leave it to the majority leader and the distinguished Vice President. I feel sure that whatever decision they reach will be agreeable so far as our side of the aisle is concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to have it distinctly understood that this is not to be regarded as a precedent. The Chair is being continually importuned to give his consent to the taking of pictures in the Senate Chamber. He has uniformly declined to allow it, because it seems to have been the desire of the Senate from time immemorial that that practice not be inaugurated. However, in view of the peculiar circumstances which exist, the situation is a little different in this instance.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Illinois that the pictures are to be made at once, that the process is not to be repeated, and that it is not to be regarded as a precedent?

Mr. LUCAS. The Vice President is absolutely correct. I may say that, as I understand it, the pictures will be made while the debate is in progress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to introduce bills

and resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit matters for printing in the RECORD, without debate, as in legislative session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 250)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 8835.)

REVISED SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, ETC. (S. DOC. NO. 96)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised supplemental estimate of appropriation involving an increase of \$3,110,112.76 in the amount necessary for payment of claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2086. A bill transferring management of certain public lands from the Agriculture Department to the Fort Sill Indian School in Oklahoma for agriculture uses; without amendment (Rept. No. 610).

By Mr. THYE (for Mr. HOLLAND), from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 2296. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653), and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 611).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2188. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to tests for brucellosis or paratuberculosis; and for other purposes; and.

S. 2189. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to coordinate the arrangements for the employment of agricultural workers admitted for temporary agricultural employment from foreign countries in the Western Hemisphere, to assure that the migration of such workers will be limited to the minimum numbers required to meet domestic labor shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 2190. A bill to amend section 2 (c) of the Clayton Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2191. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2192. A bill to authorize the adjustment of the lineal positions of certain officers of the naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

GRANTING OF CERTAIN EXTENSIONS OF TIME FOR TAX PURPOSES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3905) to grant certain extensions of time for tax purposes and to facilitate administration; which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and order to be printed.

HOUSING BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3368) to amend sections 356 and 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of the assets of a decedent's estate as a preferred charge for his or her funeral expenses from \$600 to \$1,000, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FOURTH OF JULY ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Chicago, Ill., on July 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR AMERICAN DESTINY—1949—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MUNDT

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our American Destiny—1949," delivered by him before the Annual Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, at Washington, D. C., on April 18, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM IN CHINA—ARTICLE BY SENATOR McCARRAN

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Russian Imperialism in China," written by Senator McCARRAN and published in the June issue of the National Republic, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOURTH OF JULY ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, at the West Virginia State American Legion Convention, at Wheeling, W. Va., on July 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT SOCIALISM IS DOING TO BRITISH FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY CECIL PALMER

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Socialism Is Doing to British Freedom," delivered by Cecil Palmer, of London, England, before the Economic Club of Detroit, at Detroit, Mich., on May 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORANDUM FROM AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION ON RIGHT OF BROADCASTERS TO EDITORIALIZE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum from the American Civil Liberties Union dealing with the policy of the Federal Communications Commission with relation to editorializing by radio stations, which appears in the Appendix.]

DR. DOUGLAS SOUTHALL FREEMAN—
EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Virginian Prodigy," published in the Washington Post of July 1, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE
ORGANIZATION

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the statement which I have prepared relating to the International Refugee Organization.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION
STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Mr. President, the International Refugee Organization has just observed the second anniversary of its establishment with the United States as a member. As of this date of anniversary, a distinguished American, a native of our own State of Maryland, Mr. William Hallem Tuck, is retiring after directing the IRO for the past 2 years.

Recently, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments issued a report on the operations of the IRO, prepared by a subcommittee of which I am privileged to be chairman. This report—Senate Report No. 476—noted, among other things, that membership and participation in this Organization has cost this Government over \$140,000,000 during the past 2 years; that we are already committed to contribute an additional sum in excess of \$70,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, when the program is supposed to terminate.

In addition, it disclosed a number of developments which have had the effect of impeding the expeditious liquidation of the Organization's responsibilities and obligations. However, the subcommittee concluded that blame for the delay in effecting the resettlement of displaced persons and refugees could not properly be placed upon the IRO alone, since the accomplishment of its mission has been and still is seriously hampered by failure of the nations of the world to assume their full responsibilities for the solution of the displaced persons problem, as evidenced by the fact that these nations have failed to accept an adequate number of persons for permanent immigration and by the further fact that only 18 of the 59 members of the United Nations have joined the Organization and made contributions.

Since this report was issued, I have had an opportunity to visit the IRO headquarters in Geneva and to inspect some of its operations and saw at close range the conditions under which the refugees are living in camp. Mr. Tuck showed me every courtesy and consideration. In my conversations with him and with other members of the secretariat of the IRO, I am pleased to report that I encountered a frank recognition of many of the difficulties noted in the Senate report and a sincere desire to improve them.

The IRO, under the leadership of Mr. Tuck, has certainly been performing one of the most difficult international undertakings in history. It has performed a praiseworthy task in connection with its health, care and maintenance program which has resulted in easing the misery of hundreds of thousands of unfortunate persons. It has also performed notably in preparing these persons for new ways of life in their countries of resettlement.

Mr. President, it is in connection with its resettlement program that the greatest amount remains to be done. This program has bogged down primarily because of the

unwillingness on the part of the governments of the world—and our own is included—to assume their proportionate share of responsibility. The success of the IRO's resettlement program depends entirely upon the active cooperation of these governments in accepting displaced persons for permanent resettlement.

While a great number of persons has been resettled by IRO, the fact remains, however, that more than 400,000 displaced persons remain in the camps of Europe and about 200,000 are awaiting resettlement, living outside of these camps, as best they can. The IRO was never meant to be the solution to this problem and neither the IRO nor any other international organization can provide the solution. Its success or failure in accomplishing its mission depends entirely upon the cooperation which it receives from the governments of the world.

It is thus clear, Mr. President, that the responsibility rests squarely upon the nations of the world, our own included. When these nations are willing to assume this responsibility, to the fullest extent possible, by joining the IRO as contributing members and by eliminating certain restrictions with respect to their immigration laws, this problem can be solved.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL WEB—ARTICLE BY
SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of the July 1949 issue of the magazine, *Governmental News*, a national publication for public officials.

This is issue No. 1 of volume 1 of this fine periodical of which Mr. George F. Breitbach & Sons, of Milwaukee, are publishers. In the first quarterly issue I have been happy to prepare an article entitled "Intergovernmental Web."

The main theme of this article is the legislation of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, originally introduced as S. 810, and now identified as S. 1946, to establish a national commission on intergovernmental relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERGOVERNMENTAL WEB—NURTURE GRASS
ROOTS OF GOVERNMENT FOR STRONGER DEMOCRACY—OVERCENTRALIZATION THREATENS AMERICA

(By the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

"What are we going to do about the fact that the Federal Government is more and more horning into affairs of States, counties, cities, townships, and school districts?"

"What are we going to do about the Federal Government increasing its taxation of items normally taxable by States, counties, and localities?"

"What are we going to do about the problem of centralization of more and more authority, more and more power, more and more functions in Uncle Sam in Washington?"

"What are we going to do about the problem of the increasing Federal tax-exempt property which is removing from the tax rolls more and more property which might otherwise be tapped for local revenue purposes?"

These are questions of deep interest to officials and employees at all levels of American government. All of us who believe in the American way of life—who believe in our constitutional Republic of separation of powers—of reservation of powers to the States—want to see continuing vitality for

States, counties, cities, and school districts. We don't want to see their vitality drained away by Uncle Sam.

PURPOSE OF BILL S. 810

By way of action, rather than mere words, several Senators and I have cosponsored Senate bill 810. This bill would set up a temporary Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This Commission would be along the lines of ex-President Hoover's Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government. That Commission has already contributed a wealth of information and advice on ways and means of cutting extravagance, waste, and inefficiency, securing greater coordination of Government agencies, streamlining the executive branch.

We believe that a similar workmanlike job could be done in the field of intergovernmental relations—in the field, for example, of analysis of our whole grant-in-aid system, in the field of analysis of tax exempt property and so on.

The Commission would comprise 14 members, 5 of whom would be selected by the President of the United States (2 officers of the executive branch and 3 private citizens); 2 by the President of the Senate (Members of the Senate); 2 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (Members of the House).

Two additional appointees of the President would be State officials from a panel of at least four which would be submitted by the Council of State Governments. Two more would be appointed by the President and would be municipal officials from a panel of at least four submitted jointly by the American Municipal Association and by the United States conference of mayors. A final appointee would be a county official to be selected by the President from a panel of at least two submitted by the National Association of County Officials.

The Commission would be nonpartisan, factual, and responsive to the Congress and the President.

INTERRELATED PROBLEMS

For years, those of us concerned about Federal centralization have been pleading for such a thorough analysis of the problems of intergovernmental relations. The complexity of Government at all levels of authority has grown to such tremendous extent that a current analysis could not help but shed light on mutual problems, interrelated problems and on those problems that are relatively unique to each particular level.

What do you think of this legislation? If you believe it is sound, or, for that matter, unsound, write to me or to cosponsors, Senators HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey; BRICKER, of Ohio; WILLIAMS, of Delaware; SMITH, of New Jersey; SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas; IVES, of New York; or O'CONOR, of Maryland. Better still, write to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate or to the similar committee over in the House of Representatives, which is considering a bill introduced over there by Congressman BOGES of Delaware.

JUNGLE OF RELATIONS

Whatever you think about this particular bill, I am sure that you will agree that some action is necessary to straighten out the present "jumble, the jungle, and the jangle," the confusion and mess of intergovernmental contracts.

Overcentralization of authority is one of the most critical issues in America. Industrial overcentralization is dangerous; political overcentralization is a threat; economic overcentralization, congestion of population—these are all interrelated problems.

One of the most challenging phases is military overcentralization. In the event of a future war, the congestion of governmental authority in Washington, particularly as regards the Military Establishment, would menace national security. A single atomic

bomb hitting Washington could, in a flash of blinding light, blow up the central nervous system of American defense.

CUT BACK FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

But even if there were no military threat to our country there is still too much government centralization in Washington. The Capital with its 250,000 Federal workers has become a jam-packed, bloated metropolis which could well afford to lose a considerable fraction of its Federal workers to smaller communities throughout the country. This, however, is not merely a matter of moving workers to other locations; it is a matter of sloughing off functions so that the Federal Government need not handle them at all, but might rather turn them back to States and localities for action.

UNENDING CIRCLE

But how can we cut back the 2,000,000-man pay roll of the Federal Government if:

(a) Uncle Sam continues to take over more tax areas—like the gasoline tax, the amusement tax, etc., which the States and localities need to meet their own revenue, and (b) consequently, lacking their own tax revenue, States and localities continue to run to Uncle Sam for more aid for schools, hospitals, highways, and a thousand other important purposes?

We are in a vicious circle. The more taxes Uncle Sam takes away from the States, the more the States run to Uncle Sam for money, the more Uncle Sam builds up his personnel force, the more Uncle Sam imposes additional taxes and so on ad infinitum.

TAX-EXEMPT PROPERTY BILL

Already, in the House of Representatives, there has been introduced by Congressman ENGLE of California, bill H. R. 1356, which provides payments to municipalities in lieu of taxes on federally owned real property. This legislation points up the problem faced by countless communities. (In Madison, Wis., capital of my State, for example, 30 percent of all property is tax exempt. How can the city possibly meet its expanding obligations if almost one-third of its property cannot be taxed?)

It is my own feeling, however, that before H. R. 1356 can or should be acted upon, S. 810 should be passed by the Congress. In other words, tax-exempt property is but one phase of the over-all Federal-State-local problem.

H. R. 1356 would set up a commission on Federal reimbursement to States and local government. Would not, however a commission on intergovernmental relations (such as is proposed in Senate bill 810) do a superior over-all job particularly if it has a task force (to use Hoover Commission terminology) analyze the reimbursement problem? I think so. What do you think?

MY EXCISE TAX BILL

There is no single panacea for our problem; no single cure-all. It will take much patient study, much cooperation, much give-and-take at all levels of government.

I personally have introduced legislation to cut Federal excise taxes; in many cases, to eliminate such taxes completely and leave them to the States and localities if they decide State and local excise taxes are necessary. But even my bill (S. 1029 and amendment to H. R. 2023) is only a piecemeal approach to an immense complicated problem. We need an over-all approach.

Now, my friends, what do you think about the proposal stated in this report? Are we on the beam when we recommend decentralization and a complete survey of intergovernmental relations, or are we in error? Write to your Senators or Congressmen and give them the benefit of your expert views.

The vitality of the Nation must be maintained at the grass roots of the Nation if American liberty is to endure.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

The Senate as in Committee of the Whole resumed the reconsideration of the treaty, Executive L (81st Cong., 1st sess.), signed at Washington on April 4, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The treaty is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and is open to amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as we meet in this historic chamber, around which cluster so many memories of the heroic past, in our deliberations on the great treaty which is before the Senate at the moment I desire to invoke the shades of the great men who have served and struggled here.

We are approaching one of those momentous hours in our Nation's history when we must make a decision that will have a tremendous impact upon world events for generations. I refer to the ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has just completed a systematic and painstaking study of the treaty, and now I present it for the consideration and, I hope, the overwhelming approval of the Senate. We have reached the unanimous conclusion that it is a vital forward step in the maintenance of world peace. We urge its ratification at an early date.

The treaty is a defensive pact. In it the 12 signatory nations, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States, undertake to exercise their inherent right of collective or individual self-defense against an armed attack, in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. The treaty makes clear the determination of the peoples of the North Atlantic area to do their utmost to maintain peace with justice and to take such action as they may deem necessary in the event the peace is broken.

In a word, the Atlantic Pact is an agreement among free nations who earnestly desire peace and who plan through united action to safeguard their common heritage of freedom by exercising their inherent right of self-defense against armed attack.

Tragic events since the outbreak of World War I have taught us that we cannot achieve peace by acting alone. The world has shrunk far too much for that. Distance has been annihilated, and seas which were once moats are now ocean highways that no longer protect us from attack.

Even more important is the simple fact that if we really want peace we will have to work for it. We have learned that lesson the hard way. Today all our major foreign policies reflect the overwhelming desire of our people that the power and influence of the United States should be thrown into the scales on the side of peace and freedom.

To this end we have exerted every effort to make the United Nations function effectively. We have thrown our energy and our resources solidly behind the European recovery program. The Atlantic Pact is still another indication of our determination to work constructively for world peace.

Given these factors, and given the present feeling of insecurity in the world, there is no practical alternative for the Atlantic Pact. The only alternative and, I repeat, it is not a practical or acceptable one, is uncertainty, indecision, and lack of unity on the part of the free nations of the world. That would be an open invitation to aggression and to national disaster.

In the course of my discussion I do not intend to examine in detail the various articles of the treaty. That is done in the committee report which is on the desk of every Senator. I desire to direct the attention of the Senate, however, to these basic questions: First, how was the treaty formulated? Second, what does the treaty do? Third, what does the treaty not do? Fourth, why do we need the treaty? And, fifth, what are the benefits of the treaty to the United States?

HOW THE TREATY WAS NEGOTIATED

The treaty which is now before the Senate was not hastily put together. It is not the result of a momentary impulse. It was carefully considered and negotiated over a long period of time.

Moreover, the treaty is the product of extremely close executive-legislative cooperation. Last year, it will be recalled, a number of Senators, properly concerned over the inability of the United Nations to function effectively, introduced resolutions which were designed to strengthen that organization. The Foreign Relations Committee, in consultation with the Department of State, decided that those legitimate aspirations could best be channeled into constructive action through Senate Resolution 239.

That resolution was adopted by the Senate last June by the overwhelming vote of 64 to 4. It expressed the view of the Senate that the President should do what he could to strengthen the United Nations in a variety of ways, including the development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense under the Charter. The resolution also provided for the following:

(3) Association of the United States, by constitutional process—

I wish to emphasize the words "by constitutional process"—

with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

I wish to stress that also.

(4) Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security.

That is a pronouncement of the Senate, not now, but last year. We charted the way. We outlined the course for the treaty which now is before us.

On the basis of this advice from the Senate, the Secretary of State entered into conversations with six of the signatory States about the security of the North Atlantic area. The actual negotiation of the treaty began in October, and it was signed on April 4, 1949.

I want to emphasize that the pact was not brought to us in final form on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. During the negotiations, Secretary Acheson met with the Foreign Relations Committee on two occasions to discuss, article by article, the terms of the treaty. Consultations were also held from time to time with ranking members of the committee about specific language changes. The committee thus played an important and effective role in formulating the terms of the treaty.

I want to linger on this point, Mr. President, for it is highly significant. Secretary Acheson and former Under Secretary of State Robert A. Lovett were, of course, the chief architects for the United States in building the treaty structure. But I think it is safe to say that the Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate furnished some of the stone and mixed some of the mortar to complete its symmetry and strength.

Surely no member of the Senate can criticize the President or the Secretary of State for this kind of executive-legislative teamwork. First we give them our advice as to the course they should pursue. They then negotiate the treaty, consulting with us from time to time. Now they are asking for consent to ratify the treaty, which is, in effect, our joint handiwork.

This is precisely the way the advice and consent clause of the Constitution ought to work. If this kind of partnership were made permanent with respect to important matters in the field of foreign relations, the hand of the executive branch would be greatly strengthened and our course would be a surer and a steadier one.

Mr. President, I desire to pay tribute to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee for the fine spirit which they have displayed throughout our consideration of the treaty. Their objectivity and their nonpartisan attitude have been an inspiration to me. Their loyalty to the high ideals of world peace and security should be an inspiration to all the peoples of the North Atlantic area.

I sincerely hope we shall encounter that same nonpartisan objectivity and that same loyalty to high ideals as we proceed with the debate here on the Senate floor.

In the course of our deliberations the committee heard 97 witnesses—which almost sets a record for the number of witnesses to appear before us on any particular bill or treaty. We take pride in the fact that we heard everyone who asked to appear. We concluded from the hearings that the great majority of the American people strongly support the treaty and the principles upon which it is based.

WHAT DOES THE TREATY DO?

The treaty seeks peace and security by establishing a collective defense arrangement for the North Atlantic area. It operates within the framework of the United Nations Charter and is based upon the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter.

Perhaps we can best understand the objectives of the treaty by summarizing

at the outset the new obligations undertaken by the United States.

First. To maintain and develop, separately and jointly and by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, the individual and collective capacity of the parties to resist armed attack;

Second. To consult whenever, in the opinion of any of the parties, the territorial integrity, political independence, or security of any of them is threatened;

Third. To consider an armed attack upon any of the parties in the North Atlantic area an attack against them all; and

Fourth. In the event of such an attack, to take forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as the United States deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

"Including the use of armed force" simply means that it is among the things which may be employed—not that it has to be employed, but that it is available if necessary to be employed.

Article 5 is the heart of the treaty. If the treaty fails to maintain peace and security, if the deterrent effects of articles 3, 4, and 5 fail, if an armed attack against any of us in Europe or North America does occur, then article 5 comes into operation.

In article 5 the parties have agreed to meet an armed attack by the exercise of the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter. Let me emphasize that this is an inherent right possessed by every state. It is not conferred upon them by the Charter. The Charter simply recognizes the inherent right of all states to defend themselves collectively or individually.

Article 51 of the Charter provides:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations.

In other words, the Charter recognizes that right, and does not invade the jurisdiction of the states with respect thereto.

I repeat, article 51 of the Charter provides:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations.

The use of the word "impair" recognizes the existence of that right. This means that every member of the United Nations agrees to the right of the members of the North Atlantic Pact to provide for collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs. Each and every member of the United Nations is obligated to respect that right. Article 51 is also assurance that the treaty does not conflict with the Charter, since it specifically provides that nothing in the Charter shall impair the right of self-defense. Since the treaty is an exercise of this right, the Charter makes clear that it does not interfere with the United Nations. There can be no cause of complaint from any member of the United Nations at the course outlined in the treaty.

Article 5 is based upon the fundamental proposition that an armed attack against any one of us is to be considered an attack against all. The parties thus publicly underline a basic truth which recent history has so vividly demonstrated; an attack in the North Atlantic area places all of us in such grave jeopardy that it immediately becomes a matter of collective concern and calls for collective action. It is up to the signatories to determine whether an attack has occurred. Internal disorders and revolutions will not ordinarily be considered armed attacks—and, Mr. President, mark this—unless they are aided and abetted by an outside power to such an extent that the parties decide that an armed attack has in fact taken place.

Nor will attacks of a minor character bring into full play the obligations contained in article 5. We did not go to war in 1937 when the Japanese sank our gunboat, the *Panay*, on the Yangtze River. We did not go to war in 1946 when American planes were shot down over Yugoslavia. Those incidents were settled through normal channels of diplomacy.

Article 5 obviously contemplates aggressions of a more formidable character. I doubt very much if any state which is attacked would call upon the United States for assistance unless the attack is of such magnitude and importance that its independence and integrity are threatened.

Once this original determination is made that an armed attack has occurred, then each party must forthwith take such action as it deems necessary in order to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. How far each state will go and what action it will take to fulfill its obligations will be determined by each state in the light of existing circumstances. It is possible that a diplomatic protest may suffice. On the other hand, in the face of an all-out attack, it might be necessary to bring into full play the whole weight of the partnership and the ultimate decision of war. We shall not be neutral in the face of aggression.

Finally, all measures undertaken under article 5 to repel an armed attack and to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area must be reported immediately to the Security Council. If and when the Security Council takes the necessary measures to restore peace, the measures under the treaty shall be terminated.

I want to emphasize that the serious commitment contained in article 5 is by no means world-wide in scope. It is strictly limited by the terms of article 6 to the North Atlantic area. This does not include the overseas territories of any of the signatory states. We would not consider an attack upon these territories as an attack upon us. The only outlying territories covered are Alaska, the Aleutian Islands, the islands of the Canadian Arctic, and the islands in the North Atlantic area generally.

Already we see that the treaty is not typical of the ad hoc alliances, used so extensively in modern European history, to meet a particular crisis or to wage a particular war; nor is it typical of the treaties which were designed to achieve a

delicate balancing of power. Alliances and coalitions have usually been directed against or have sought protection from a definite opponent. The North Atlantic Treaty is directed against any armed attack within a specified area.

Together we are seeking to increase the measure of our own security by self-help and mutual aid pledged in article 3. We are determined to knit our separate and otherwise isolated strengths into a single protective cloak capable of resisting any aggressive attack. We have a common heritage to defend and a single purpose to serve. It is natural that we should unite to strengthen our hands to ward off annihilation through disunity. The Canadian Prime Minister put it well in the debate in Parliament, when he said:

The pact is based on the belief that we have in our collective manpower, in our collective natural resources, in our collective industrial potential and industrial know-how that which would make us a very formidable enemy for any possible aggressor to attack.

It is to be noted that the man who said that, the Premier of Canada, was recently overwhelmingly approved by the Canadian people at the polls.

I would not wish to underestimate the efforts required of all of us to build a suitable defense capacity, nor the difficulty of maintaining the priority of economic recovery in the face of these intolerable burdens put upon peaceful nations. But I am certain that article 3 will enable all of us to consider defense measures on a very practical basis, to comprehend rational arrangements that will in the long run help to reduce the burdens of armaments. In this connection, one should note the North Atlantic Council and Defense Committee set up by article 9 on which all members are equally represented, the small states and the great states alike. This machinery for collective consultation and collective recommendations on our common responsibilities should prove highly helpful on such matters.

What obligations does the United States assume under article 3? What is the relationship between the treaty and military-assistance program? The military-assistance program has not yet been submitted to the Congress, but it is in the discussions and in the thoughts of Senators, no doubt. If a Senator votes for the treaty does that mean he is obligated to vote for the military-assistance program? These pointed questions have been raised by Members of the Senate and they deserve a candid reply.

The United States—like all the other signatories—has assumed an important obligation under article 3. We have committed ourselves to the principle of self-help and mutual aid. We have agreed to work together in building up the capacities of all the signatories to defend themselves against attack. But we have not committed ourselves to any particular type of military-assistance program. There were no secret agreements at the negotiation of this pact. There were no undercover commitments. Everything that is committed is written into the face of the treaty.

It is true that the treaty and the military-assistance program are closely re-

lated. But they are not Siamese twins; they are not inseparable. Each program should be passed upon separately by the Congress; each should be accepted or rejected on its own merits.

My own view is that we should proceed forthwith to ratify the treaty and implement it by approving the military-assistance program during the present session of the Congress. Time is highly important in this great enterprise, and we must let our partners know, as soon as we can, that not only words but deeds are a part of our policy.

It is entirely possible, however, that even a strong supporter of the treaty might find good and legitimate reasons for opposing the military-assistance program. That is a matter for each Senator to decide as he searches his own conscience and exercises his own honest judgment.

Many partnerships in history brought the weaker ally or allies into complete bondage to a greater power. The North Atlantic Treaty does not do this. Never in peacetime have signatories to a treaty attempted so extensively and with such evidence of good faith in each other's intents and interests to strengthen one another through mutual aid. This becomes especially noteworthy in that not even the weakest nation in the pact has come under servitude to its stronger partners or has lost its parity, its independence, or its sovereignty.

Right at this point let me draw attention to article 2 which makes perfectly clear that the treaty is not exclusively military in its implications. The signatories have recognized, and have demonstrated their conviction, that economic collaboration and well-being help to lessen international tensions among themselves and with the rest of the world, and help to destroy the seeds of war. This is an exceptionally important element in the treaty: the existence as well as the cultivation of the prerequisites for peaceful change.

Like articles 2 and 3, article 4 underlines the preventive character of the treaty. I think that article 4 goes a long way to emphasize that the period of dividing and conquering has come to an end. The consultation provided for in that article addresses itself to the threatening of the territorial integrity, the political independence, or the security of any of the parties. Consultation is not an unnecessary luxury; it is a logical requirement to gain the objectives of the treaty. For one thing, article 4, without in any way undermining the consultative features of the United Nations, rightly faces up to the brutal fact that peaceful peoples have become more and more conscious of a sinister kind of danger—indirect aggression. Let us not forget that no bombs were dropped by the Soviet Union on Bulgaria, Hungary, or Czechoslovakia.

One sometimes hears complaints about treaties because they seek to guarantee some hopeless kind of status quo or some particular territorial arrangement. The North Atlantic Treaty seeks to protect the following status quo: The United Nations; a common heritage of civilization; freedom; the principles of democracy; individual liberty; the rule of law;

peace, and security. I fail to find anything evil or hopeless or objectionable about that kind of status quo. It is vibrant, flexible, honorable, giving room for the progress of men and nations. It can only offend the most blatantly aggressive and those dedicated to world domination.

There is no easy formula for peace. Democracy and peace must always be dynamic. Nor is there any reason to assume that because the members of the North Atlantic community are dedicated to peace, they are thereby doomed to be outpaced by a kind of supercharged, totalitarian fanaticism.

I draw the attention of the Senate now to articles 12 and 13 which provide for the indefinite duration of the treaty and for its review after 10 years. Review and amendment may of course take place earlier by unanimous consent. A party may cease to be a member after 20 years. These time periods seem reasonable, since it is impossible to bring security and stability to the North Atlantic area under a treaty of short duration.

Will the partnership endure that long? Obviously, the treaty is not yet in force and has not been tested by time. But I think there can be no doubt that the partnership will last, resolutely, until the menace of aggression has disappeared and until the United Nations is able to give adequate assurance of world security. This particular document does not need to last any longer than that. I am confident that the signatories would be only too willing to permit it to lapse when that happy time arrives.

WHAT THE TREATY DOES NOT DO

I should like Senators to give attention to what the treaty does not do. Let us consider that point. To make the record perfectly clear, it is just as important to understand what it does not do as what it actually does.

As I sat through the hearings and listened to 97 different witnesses it seemed to me the five main criticisms emerged. Some argued that the treaty involves a commitment for the United States to go to war without congressional approval; that it runs counter to our obligations under the United Nations Charter; that it is an old-fashioned military alliance; that it is directed against the Soviet Union; and that it places our stamp of approval on the colonial policies of Great Britain, France, Holland, and the other signatory states.

Mr. President, the committee examined these criticisms very precisely and very thoroughly. Our considered answer to each one of them is a categorical "No."

The treaty does not involve any commitment to go to war nor does it change the relative authority of the President and the Congress with respect to the use of the armed forces.

That will, no doubt, be discussed in detail during the progress of the debate, both for and against the treaty.

I am fully aware of the fact that this latter problem might well stir up endless days of debate on the Senate floor. It is true that the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy has always possessed considerable authority to use the armed forces without

congressional approval; but the line of authority between the President and Congress has never been clearly drawn, except it is clear, I think, that a state of war, which is something more than the use of armies, must be declared by the Congress of the United States.

Moreover, it is neither necessary nor desirable for us to attempt to draw that line during this debate. It would be foolhardy for us to assume that we could do in a few days' time what our forefathers have been unable to do in a century and a half of our national existence. It is sufficient for our purposes to underline the basic principle that nothing in the treaty either increases or decreases the constitutional powers of either the President or the Congress with respect to the use of the armed forces.

While the treaty was being drafted rumors circulated about Washington that article 5 carried with it a commitment which would bind the United States automatically to go to war in the event of an armed attack. I challenge anyone to find such a commitment. The words of article 11—that the provisions of the treaty will be carried out by the parties "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes"—are unequivocally clear on this point. That nails it down absolutely. Not only must we ratify the treaty by constitutional processes, but it will be carried out under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. The full authority of the Congress to declare war, with all the discretion that power implies, remains unimpaired.

We have a further important safeguard in the phrase "such action as it deems necessary" found in article 5. These words mean that, in event of an armed attack, the United States will be free to decide for itself what measures it will take to restore the peace and security of the North Atlantic area. We will have full opportunity to exercise our judgment in each case that arises.

This is not the view of the United States Government alone; it is the understanding of all the signatories. The British white paper on the Atlantic Pact contains the following reference to article 5:

It leaves the action to be taken to the judgment of each individual country, thereby fully safeguarding the constitutional right of Parliament in all democratic countries to decide the issue of peace and war. * * *

Some of our people may not understand that clause, but the British understood it, as was indicated in their white paper. But let us not avoid cold reality by searching for escape clauses. We would be doing a great disservice to our country and to the cause of world peace if we were to minimize the importance of the obligation we are assuming under the treaty.

It might be well to repeat at this point the far-reaching nature of those obligations. If an armed attack should occur in the North Atlantic area the action we would take would depend, of course, upon the location, nature, and scale of the attack. In the face of an all-out attack we might decide that war would be necessary to restore the peace and security of the North Atlantic area.

On the other hand there are many effective measures short of the use of armed force which might suffice, depending upon the circumstances. Whatever we do will have to be done in accordance with our established constitutional procedures.

The security of the North Atlantic area and its freedom from armed aggression, are necessary to the safety and security of the United States. If the areas at our very doors are to be invaded by armies with guns in their hands and by airplanes with bombs and all of the weapons of war, there can be no security in the United States or among its people. War and aggression must be kept beyond the boundaries of the North Atlantic area. We cannot tolerate the grabbing off of weak or defenseless nations closer and closer to the United States. Aggressors and conquerors must keep their distance. They must not extend their mailed hands into this territory.

Totalitarian and communistic powers have publicly announced their policy to be a conquest of the entire globe and its subjection to their economic and political theory. Will free nations and free men blind their eyes to this hostile threat? Will they close their ears to this brutal demand that they be doomed to slavery? With this bold and savage announcement, it is fundamental that free nations of Europe and North America should be determined to preserve the institutions of their free governments as against the ambitions and conquest by these sinister and ruthless forces.

The processes by which strong military imperialistic countries have in recent years picked off country by country are distinct and clear in the minds of the people of the United States. Hitler by arms seized Austria and incorporated it into the Reich. Sudetenland was annexed. When war with all of its blood and terror burst upon the world, Poland was subdued, Czechoslovakia fell to the arms of Hitler, France was overrun, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, and other defenseless and weakened nations were conquered and placed under the iron heel of Hitler. Their institutions were overthrown, their liberty was destroyed, their territory was violated, and cruel and galling tyranny was inflicted upon them. Such a riot of arms and blood must not occur again. The united strength of peaceful and peace-loving peoples can prevent the violation of their rights and the dismemberment of their nations, if their strength is united and made effective against aggressors and despots.

This area is dedicated to peace and to security. It must not become the lair of the armies of greedy nations anxious for conquest. It must not become the nest of totalitarian powers who seek to subvert, not alone the peace and security, but the traditions of this magnificent territory. These things all shine through the treaty and give it life and vitality and vigor.

Liberty is without price. It is purchased in blood. Its preservation is the highest duty of a government. The Atlantic Pact is an effort to coordinate and consolidate that duty upon the group as a whole rather than to leave each

individual country the hopeless task of defending itself. If the world is to be under the constant threat of attack or of absorption, no nation is any longer free from the shadow of armed might. Are the nations of the world to live in an atmosphere of fear and terror and anxiety for the safety of their children and the safety of their children's children?

Whenever freedom is destroyed, freedom is weakened in every country. Whenever security is increased, the safety of every country is increased.

The treaty does not run counter to any of our obligations under the United Nations. Quite the contrary, it has been conceived within the framework of that organization and in its preamble the contracting parties solemnly reaffirm their dedication to the high purposes and principles of the Charter. It is soundly and solidly based on article 51 of the Charter which specifically recognizes the inherent right of states to defend themselves, either individually or collectively, against armed attack.

I am well aware of the argument, Mr. President, that article 51 does not envisage the establishment of any collective self-defense arrangements in advance of an armed attack. What would the exponents of this theory have us do—wait until western Europe is overrun and call a conference to determine the counter-measures that should be taken? Obviously, both individual and collective self-defense measures must be prepared in advance if they are to be effective. The logic of the case is more than compelling; it is overwhelming.

If any further evidence is necessary to prove the point, let me remind my colleagues of article 1 of the treaty in which the signatories reaffirm their solemn obligations under the Charter to settle their disputes by peaceful means. Let me remind them of article 5 which makes clear that collective action will not be taken unless the Security Council has been unable to prevent an armed attack; that all measures taken as a result of an attack shall immediately be reported to the Council; and that any such action must cease whenever the Council is able to restore peace and security.

Finally, let me remind the Senate of article 7. This article sweeps away any possible doubt by underlining once more the overriding authority of the Charter and assuring us all that the provisions of the Charter will govern, wherever they are applicable, all activities undertaken under the treaty.

Nor should the consultations provided for in article 4 impair in any way the effectiveness of United Nations machinery. In practice such consultation should rarely take place.

It is the opinion of the committee—

Read the committee report—

that consultation under article 4 should not be sought unless the United Nations for some reason is prevented from dealing with the situation giving rise to consultation. The committee wishes to emphasize this view since it has consistently supported the United Nations as the cornerstone of American foreign relations, and would be loath to see any action taken not entirely in harmony with this policy.

The treaty thus scrupulously avoids any conflict with the United Nations. It will not duplicate in any way the machinery or the procedures established under the Charter. It will not compete with the United Nations but will serve as a valuable complement to its activities.

Mr. President, I stand second to none in my desire to preserve the vitality and the integrity of the United Nations. I firmly believe the treaty is entirely consistent with the Charter and will greatly assist in maintaining peace and security—which is the primary purpose of the United Nations.

The treaty is not directed against the Soviet Union nor its satellite states. What a splendid thing it would be if the millions of people behind the iron curtain had the same opportunity as the people of the free world to read the committee report on the Atlantic Pact. They would see that the pact is not aimed at them or any other group of states; it is aimed only against aggression and war.

They would find, many of them to their surprise no doubt, that the 12 signatories to the treaty are willing and anxious to cooperate in every way to keep the peace. But they would find, also, that these 12 states are equally determined, if their efforts to keep the peace are frustrated, to stand resolutely together to safeguard their freedom and their civilization against aggression.

Mr. President, no person in the United States need fear our laws against burglary unless he is a burglar or is getting ready to commit burglary. By the same token no state need fear this treaty unless it is planning an aggressive act or has aggressive designs in its heart. As Secretary Acheson reminded us during the hearings, "the guilty flee when no man pursueth."

Certainly no one has any grounds whatsoever for accusing the United States of any aggressive intent. Our rapid and extensive demobilization following World War II and our persistent efforts to bring about world peace make that perfectly clear.

If the Soviet Union really believes the pact is aimed at her, then I suggest that she demonstrate her peaceful intentions and embrace a policy of full cooperation with the North Atlantic countries within the framework of the United Nations. Such a course would return rich dividends to the Soviet people and to the rest of the world, both in terms of increased security and general well-being.

The treaty is not an old-fashioned military alliance comparable to those which characterized European power politics in bygone centuries.

Mr. President, I do not want to quibble over terms. I am well aware of the fact that many types of alliances have existed in the past, some of them purely defensive in nature. But it would be highly unfortunate if the treaty were to be tagged with a misleading label, thus casting doubt upon the motives of the signatories, when, in fact, it differs from the traditional military alliances of the past both in letter and in spirit.

Both George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were fully aware of the unsavory aspects of the old-fashioned

military alliances. They knew that some of them, often secret in character, were designed to further the personal ambitions of individual monarchs. They knew full well that many of them were aimed at national aggrandizement and were aggressive in spirit, if not in letter. They knew, too, that such alliances might well engulf our country in the maelstrom of power politics.

That is why Washington advised the United States in his Farewell Address not to "entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambitions, rival interests, humor, or caprice." And that is why Jefferson in his first inaugural warned us against entangling alliances.

The Napoleonic wars were raging in Europe. The Continent was enmeshed in alliances which had for their purposes not peace but war.

But the kind of alliances Washington and Jefferson had in mind were vastly different from the Atlantic Pact. They were individual partnerships for power rather than a general partnership for peace.

Let us look for a moment at the other side of the balance sheet. The Atlantic Pact is not aggressive; it is purely defensive in character. It is not the design of a few monarchs, but has the popular support of the nearly 300,000,000 people of the North Atlantic area. It does not contain any commitment to go to war. It is not aimed at aggrandizement and is surrounded by all the solemn obligations against aggression which the United Nations Charter imposes upon its members. It comes into operation only when a nation has committed a criminal act by launching an attack against a party to the treaty. It does not carry with it any secret additional protocols.

It may be stated authoritatively, without any equivocation whatever—and the Secretary of State and his assistants and all connected with the treaty give us the most solemn assurances to that effect—that no commitments, no promises, no secret agreements were made; and, Mr. President, if they had been made they would have no effect, because the Congress stands here on guard. There is no obligation of any kind except what is written in the treaty itself.

Upon reflection it is unthinkable that 12 nations, who have traditionally supported democratic principles, could ever conspire together to negotiate any of the notorious secret deals which were often associated with traditional bilateral alliances.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield, or does he prefer not to yield at this time?

Mr. CONNALLY. I would prefer to wait until I am through, and then I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask a question. Would the Senator object if I were to ask the question at this time? The question is whether the Senator included Portugal among the democratic nations to which he has referred?

Mr. CONNALLY. When I finish my main address I shall be glad to talk about that. I am sure the Senator from Missouri is asking for information only.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am asking for information as to whether the Senator includes Portugal in that list?

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; we will talk about that later.

It is unthinkable that 12 nations, who have traditionally supported democratic principles, could ever conspire together to negotiate any of the notorious secret deals which were often associated with traditional bilateral alliances. There is always a reassuring safety in numbers in such an enterprise and the very size of the membership of the Atlantic Pact is in itself an adequate guaranty that the pact means exactly what it says.

I repeat what I said during the hearings. If the Atlantic Pact is an alliance, then it is an alliance only against war itself.

Finally, the treaty does not constitute, in any fashion, any endorsement on the part of the United States of the colonial policies of any of the signatory states.

Mr. President, I think I can dispose of this point in short order. I agree 100 percent with those who argue that this treaty should not be either the front door, the side door, or the back door through which the United States might be drawn into family quarrels between the signatory parties and their overseas territories in Africa, the Far East, or other parts of the world.

In my view these two matters are wholly unrelated. Let us not forget that this treaty is limited in scope. Its main purpose is to maintain the peace and security of the north Atlantic area. We do not propose to stretch its terms to cover the entire globe.

When we ratify this treaty, therefore, we do not by that act, indicate either our approval or our disapproval of the colonial policy of the other signatory powers. When such questions arise—and I have no doubt they will—we shall have to formulate our policy in the light of the situation existing at the time and the merits of the particular case.

WHY DO WE NEED THE TREATY?

The answer to the question, Why do we need the treaty? can be found in the history of our times. I recall vividly the San Francisco Conference where the victorious powers with unbounded faith and hope signed the Charter of the United Nations. We signed that document with the hope that it gave us at least the foundations upon which to build a future of peace, freedom, and human happiness.

No international document was ever endowed by the people of the world with greater promise of security and prosperity. In the very first article the signatories pledged themselves to maintain international peace and security, and to that end "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of aggression or other breaches of the peace. * * *

The significance of this commitment cannot be overestimated, because it was taken after a decade and a half of aggressions by Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito, and other Fascist dictators. Fresh in everybody's mind were the cynical conquests of Manchuria, Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Baltic

Republics. The world to its sorrow had learned the aggressor's technique of dividing and conquering those upon whom his aggression was to be visited. Potential allies had been enticed apart, and fifth columns had been used to soften the victim from within. Fear and terror had been unhesitatingly resorted to whenever they promised desired results. To end all this the United Nations had fought a bitter, bloody war.

Yet here we stand, 4 years away from San Francisco, with undiminished belief in the Charter, in the correctness of its work and spirit, and in the fundamental need for a universal United Nations. But no sincere and realistic person can blind himself to the fact that peace is still remote and the security we long for is yet to be attained. The long catalog of 30 Soviet vetoes and the frustrated efforts to write a peace treaty with Germany bear eloquent witness of how effectively the peace and security machinery of the world has been hampered.

We have become painfully aware that the technique of "divide and conquer" is not a thing of the past but a part of the insecure present. It has been given fresh life and application during the past 4 years in country after country. The catalog of its victims is even more imposing than that compiled by aggressor nations before World War II.

There was once a Republic of Estonia. Where now is Estonia? Its soil remains, but its democracy has been ruthlessly destroyed. It has been transformed into a police state.

There was once a Lithuania. Where is that nation today? The basic freedoms of its people have been brutally usurped. It has been absorbed into a vast communistic system.

There was once a Latvia. Where now is the fair land we knew as Latvia? Its boundaries have disappeared. It has been incorporated into the totalitarian network of eastern Europe.

There was once a democratic Czechoslovakia. Over the centuries its people have stood for freedom and self-government. All the world knows what has happened in that unhappy land. Democracy has been routed. Tyranny has been enthroned. Free government has been banished.

The same tragedy has taken place in differing degree in other countries. Where is the freedom of the so-called liberated peoples of Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Albania? Overshadowed by the might of their eastern neighbor, and alone, one by one, they have been subjugated by aggression from within and from without.

Let us be perfectly frank. Such a situation, which breeds fear and suspicion and distrust, is a constant threat to world peace. It is a threat to the security of peaceful peoples who desire to lead their own lives and to direct their own future, free from the destructive impact of infiltration, and free from the menacing arms of a hostile power.

The security of the North Atlantic area is necessary to the security of the United States. I emphasize that statement. Iceland, Greenland, and Canada are our front door. That door must be guarded and defended.

It is now perfectly obvious that there is only one way to peace and security for the remaining free states of the world, and that is through cooperation. Only through determined and cooperative action can we maintain our independence and freedom. To the end that we may preserve these hard-won and treasured heritages we have voluntarily and mutually entered into the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. President, I am completely convinced that if the Kaiser had known in 1914 that his ruthless attack upon Belgium and France would have led Great Britain and the United States to hurl their armed might against him, he never would have crossed the Belgian frontier.

I am completely convinced, too, that if Hitler had known in 1939 that the United States and the other United Nations would have stood together against his marching millions, he never would have launched World War II.

The unwillingness on the part of the free nations of the world to make clear in advance their determination effectively to oppose aggression was in large measure responsible for the two great wars of our time.

All during the 1930's the League of Nations was plagued with this same doubt and uncertainty. Manchuria, Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia—all were victories for the aggressor because League members failed to stand united in defense of the Covenant.

Last year this committee in its report on Senate Resolution 239 commented as follows:

The committee is convinced that the horrors of another world war can be avoided with certainty only by preventing war from starting. The experience of World War I and World War II suggest that the best deterrent to aggression is the certainty that immediate and effective countermeasures will be taken against those who violate the peace.

President Truman has this same lesson in mind when he delivered his inaugural address last January. "If we can make it sufficiently clear, in advance," he said, "that any armed attack affecting our national security would be met with overwhelming force, the armed attack might never occur."

The main objective of the North Atlantic Treaty is to erase any possible doubt and uncertainty that may be lurking in the minds of potential aggressors. We must provide unmistakable proof this time that the free nations will stand together to resist armed attack from any quarter. History must not be allowed to repeat itself. War is not inevitable.

It is confidently believed that the ratification of the treaty will exert a tremendous deterrent in preventing armed attack. The knowledge of any nation with criminal designs to absorb or conquer a small or weak nation that an armed attack by it upon such nation would meet with united resistance of the signatories to the pact would discourage that nation and probably prevent its criminal enterprise.

The deterring effect of a warning in advance is clearly illustrated by the

Monroe Doctrine. I digress to observe that in this Chamber the Senate of that time, 1823, had presented to it and had read the stirring lines of the Monroe Doctrine. In 1823, when President Monroe made his famous proclamation, he did so in order to arrest the scheming of Spain and the Holy Alliance. The Holy Alliance, composed of the sovereigns of Russia, Prussia, and Austria in 1823 plotted the destruction of the republics in South and Central America and the reinstatement of monarchies in those lands. Their designs upon Spain's former colonies in the New World were forestalled by Monroe's firm declaration that the United States would "consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." In the face of those stirring words, the Holy Alliance abandoned its designs, and the Western Hemisphere was saved.

While the United States was involved in the War Between the States in 1861, imperialists in France conceived an enterprise against the integrity and sovereignty of Mexico. The United States registered its opposition. French forces invaded Mexico and captured the capitol on June 7, 1863. The French proclaimed Mexico a monarchy and installed Maximilian as emperor with the support of French troops.

The United States had to content itself with sending diplomatic notes since she could neither drive out the French nor help Juarez to do so. Upon the termination of the War Between the States, the attitude of the United States toward the French in Mexico became firm and determined. Secretary of State Seward, whose portrait looks down upon us in this Chamber, warned France against any permanent occupation of Mexico.

The War Between the States having come to an end, the United States was free to dislodge the French from Mexico. In 1867, Napoleon III withdrew his troops from Mexico, and abandoned Maximilian to the fury of Juarez.

The mere announcement of the Monroe Doctrine deterred the Holy Alliance in its plans of conquest. The announcement that the United States would maintain the Monroe Doctrine in Mexico ousted the French from Mexico and dethroned the usurper Maximilian. Not a gun was fired, not a cannon was discharged, not an act of the military was necessary to invoke the principles and precepts of the Monroe Doctrine.

Through more than a century of dynamic application the Monroe Doctrine kept aggression from the doorstep of the New World and preserved the territorial integrity of that entire area. Not a gun was fired in maintaining that Doctrine—not even when it was applied in bringing to an end the ill-starred empire of Maximilian in Mexico. For almost a century and a quarter, it grew in strength and power and played an important role in assuring peace and security in the New World. No clearer proof exists that security lies in letting the aggressor know in advance that resistance awaits his criminal act.

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS TO THE UNITED STATES?

Every citizen of this country, and especially every elected representative of the people, must ask himself this fundamental question: How does the treaty benefit my country? There is nothing mean, narrow, or ignoble in using this yardstick—a yardstick that all the signatory powers also use—because in this treaty, the advantages gained by the other members are also our benefits, and our gains coincide with their own. I will go even further: The benefits of this pact will be reaped by peace-loving nations everywhere.

The principal benefit to the United States is the great promise this treaty holds for an enduring world peace. Certainly the United States, as much as any other country, has a tremendously high stake in the kind of peace and security which give opportunity for the full application of our vast energies for the promotion of greater well-being, strong democratic institutions and principles, and the maintenance of our way of life.

Perhaps we do not yet have the same haunting sense of insecurity that hampers many other nations. But we, too, can make use of the added confidence flowing from this treaty, so that this citadel of freemen may continue to give encouragement to the dynamic, constructive values and energies inherent in mankind throughout the world.

By now, every student of elementary history knows that in strengthening the security of the North Atlantic area, the treaty greatly increases the national security of the United States. Our frontier is no longer Texas. That word "frontier", so rich with glorious memories of our national history, has been altered by the realities of modern times. We now have a frontier of collective security and defense in Europe.

It is obvious that the United States gains much by declaring now, in this written pact, the course of action we would follow even if the treaty did not exist. Without a treaty, we were drawn into two world wars to preserve the security of the North Atlantic community. Can anyone doubt that we would become involved in a third world conflict if it should ever come?

After the United States is involved in war, it cooperates with and coordinates its activities with its allies. A joint enterprise to win the war and defend its cause in union with its associates is launched with all of its power and might. If it is wise and desirable to cooperate with our partners after we shall have been involved in a war, why should it be wrong or unwise to cooperate with them prior to the outbreak of war for the purpose of preventing war?

From now on, no one will misread our motives or underestimate our determination to stand in defense of our freedom. By letting the world know exactly where we stand, we erect a fundamental policy that outlasts the daily fluctuations of diplomacy, and the twists and turns of psychological warfare which the Soviet Union has chosen to wage against us. This public preview of our intentions has a steadying effect upon the course of human events both at home, where our

people want no more Normandy beachheads, and abroad, where men must work and live in the sinister shadow of aggression.

The treaty, in thus encouraging a feeling of confidence and security, will provide an atmosphere in which the European recovery program can move forward with new vitality. We know that encouraging progress has already been made. We know, too, that a momentum of confidence has been building up in Europe as a direct result of our assistance.

But that is not enough. The greatest obstacle that stands in the way of complete recovery is the pervading and paralyzing sense of insecurity. The treaty is a powerful antidote to this poison. It will go far in dispelling the fear that has plagued Europe since the war.

With this protection afforded by the Atlantic Pact, western Europe can breathe easier again. It can plan its future with renewed hope. New business enterprises, increased trade, and planning for long-range recovery should be the direct results.

The treaty is thus a logical and necessary complement to the recovery program. Through it we shall protect our past and future investments in that famous calculated risk which already has paid remarkable dividends. We might even look forward to the time when we can anticipate rather substantial savings in our ECA expenditures, once the full impact of the treaty has been felt in Europe.

The Economic Cooperation Administration was the most gigantic and generous act of its kind ever undertaken by any government. It has had a marvelous success toward rehabilitating the economies of western Europe which were shattered and mutilated by the tragedy of war.

However, it deals with material things, with food and clothing, with production and transportation and business activities. All these things are absolutely essential to the well-being of the broken economies of these lands.

Of even more importance, however, is the rehabilitation of the morale of the peoples of western Europe, of the revival of their sense of hope and the quickening of their desire and ability to preserve their freedoms and their forms of government and the willingness to resist the invasion of their territory or assaults upon their institutions. The North Atlantic Treaty is designed to give encouragement and a tougher and more enduring quality to the morale of the people of these lands. Its purpose is to rehabilitate their courage and strength and their determination to preserve their traditional attachment to the institutions of liberty and to the basic principles and civilizations of their peoples. These are the mighty forces which the pact is intended to invigorate and revive.

In this great area, liberty and parliamentary government have flourished as in no other area on the globe. These noble objectives must be preserved. They must continue to inspire the civilization and guide the destiny of the free world.

At this point let me digress for a few moments to speak of the German problem. Germany lies at the heart of world peace. Clearly no viable settlement can be devised for Europe unless this question is approached in a constructive and statesmanlike fashion.

As one of the occupying powers we must insist, of course, that the new German state should never be permitted to develop in such a way as to menace the peace of the world again. On the other hand, we must use our influence to provide for the German people a hopeful future as an integral part of free Europe. Unless this is done we face the dismal prospect of driving them into the waiting arms of communism.

Thus far a constructive integration of Germany into western Europe has been made extremely difficult because of the fear that Germany would become too strong for the comfort of our European allies. The increased unity and security which the pact will assure our North Atlantic partners will do much to alleviate this fear and to pave the way for fuller participation of Germany in western European affairs. There is indeed already encouraging evidence that this will happen.

This leads me to mention yet another great advantage to this country: I refer to the pledge of self-help and mutual aid to maintain and develop the individual and collective capacities of the member states to resist armed attack. We must never forget that in this collective enterprise their strength is our strength. Their weakness is our weakness. It would be inimical to our own national interest and to the cause of world peace if the free countries of Europe were to become so weak and defenseless as to invite disaster, one by one. That would indeed be the road to war.

We all know that the neighborhood bully is not likely to pick a fight with the boy across the street if he knows there are both the strength and the will to resist. By the same token potential aggressors can best be deterred by the united efforts of determined allies, who, by working together each in his most effective way, achieve maximum defense benefits with minimum costs.

I hasten to assure the Senate that this is no one-way street. We shall all profit from the principle that each participant must do its utmost to help itself and its fair share to help the others. I am convinced that in time our own defense capacity will be increased markedly by the determined efforts of our partners.

There is one final benefit which, in all candor, should not be overlooked. If our efforts for peace fail and war is thrust upon us we shall not stand alone. Our strategic positions will be greatly improved and we shall have a much better opportunity to make effective use of our armed strength. Eleven friendly nations, with a vigorous population and vast industrial production, pledge to stand with us and to resist the attack from whatever quarter it may come. This means for all parties a greater confidence that any international criminal, who violates the charter and uses armed

force against us, can be successfully resisted and ultimately defeated.

* I said at the outset that we are making a momentous decision in the development of the foreign relations of the United States. But certainly there is nothing very novel in saying we shall defend ourselves in case of attack. That has always been our policy. What is more, the North Atlantic treaty is the logical outgrowth of the policies which we have evolved during the last few years. It follows naturally upon the commitments of mutual aid and collective self-defense undertaken by the Declaration of Chapultepec, the United Nations Charter, and the Rio Pact, which put into treaty form the Monroe Doctrine.

The Monroe Doctrine was the foundation upon which the Act of Chapultepec was erected by representatives of the American States at a conference in the city of Mexico. Later, on September 2, 1947, there was signed, in Rio de Janeiro, the International Treaty of Mutual Assistance, which transformed the Act of Chapultepec into a regional collective defense arrangement and placed it on a permanent treaty basis within the framework of the United Nations. In that treaty, it was agreed that an armed attack upon any party to the treaty would be regarded as an attack upon all the signatories.

President Monroe warned the aggressor that an attack upon any state in the New World would be considered an attack against us and would meet with our determined resistance. Let me repeat, for over a century this doctrine has remained a source of great security to us and to our southern neighbors. It kept Spain from embarking upon a reconquest of her lost South American colonies and prevented Russia from extending her domain to California. It drove the Emperor Maximilian from the throne of Mexico, and it turned the German Navy from Venezuela's door. The treaty which the Committee on Foreign Relations now presents for favorable Senate action is but the logical extension of the principle of the Monroe Doctrine to the North Atlantic area.

Finally, we do not lightly disregard the past, nor shirk the present, nor prophesy the future. But in ratifying this treaty, the Senate of the United States heeds the voice and successful statesmanship of our glorious past. The Senate realistically and courageously applies to the present the force of our matured responsibility and world leadership. By this action, the Senate does not prophesy the future; it guarantees there is one for free nations.

Recent developments, including the results of the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, convince me that our present foreign policy is based on sound principles. The Soviet Union understands firmness; they understand what we mean when we say with conviction that we are going to stand on what is right and what is just.

A wide chasm of differences still yawns between the east and the west. Any weakness or vacillation on our part will be thoroughly exploited by the Soviet Union and will broaden the chasm,

rather than narrow it. We are on the right road. We shall move firmly and resolutely toward our goal.

In some totalitarian quarters the charge is made that the United States seeks to employ the North Atlantic Treaty as an instrument of imperialist policy. The United States is assailed as the symbol of imperialism with the purpose of subordinating the signatories to the treaty to its will and to control their affairs and policy. A more false charge was never advanced in modern history.

The course of the United States in the field of foreign policy is well-known in every country in the world. They are aware of our power and resources; of our industrial preeminence; of our naval and military command of the oceans and the air. They know that these superb resources have not been employed to establish an empire. They respect our world influence and leadership in the cause of peace and international cooperation. They remember our part in establishing the United Nations and advancing its objectives of preventing war and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means rather than by the sword. They know that ambition for dominion is not the motive of our policy.

The Spanish-American War thrust the destiny of Cuba and the Philippines into our keeping. The United States guaranteed the freedom and independence of Cuba and aided her in the establishment of and maintenance of her government, and through the years has manifested her friendship and support. The United States generously aided the Philippines in improving their educational and economic systems and granted them freedom and independence. We pulled down the Stars and Stripes and lifted high the banner of the Philippines. In World War II, the United States fought in defense of the Philippines and aided their reconstruction from the ravages of war.

After our victory in World War I, we claimed no added territory, we demanded no reparations nor indemnity nor tribute. In World War II we poured out our treasure and the blood of our gallant sons on the seas and on the land and in the skies to defend liberty and to crush tyranny and military mastery of the world.

Though World War II has not yet been terminated by treaties of peace, the United States, in a noble endeavor to guarantee a peaceful world and to banish war, has not followed the course of selfish gain. The United States has extended aid and assistance to many nations through the Marshall plan and other measures. The North Atlantic Treaty is in harmony with that high purpose.

We stand before the bar of history. We shall face its judgment without fear. We strive to strengthen liberty and security to the free nations of the world. We await the verdict of the years with supreme confidence. Our motives and our conduct will be vindicated and will receive the plaudits of grateful nations and of their people.

We do not covet empire. We do not covet control of any other nation. We abhor tyranny, whether by arms or by devious and secret pressure, with the

threat of grim force behind them. We do covet peace. We do covet security. We do covet freedom. We do covet the right of free nations and freemen to live without the fear of conquest or subjugation.

Under the Atlantic Pact no sword leaps from its scabbard; no plane drops its bombs; no soldier marches with a gun in his hand, until an armed attack, in violation of international law, is made upon a peaceful member of the pact.

As Senators drive around Washington, they may observe at the entrance to certain streets and areaways a sign erected by the police, reading "Do not enter."

The North Atlantic Treaty is a flaming sign to any aggressor, to any nation that contemplates armed attack upon a peaceful and law-abiding nation—"Do not enter" the North Atlantic area. The North Atlantic area must be a sanctuary against armed attack, against the violation of the security of peaceful nations.

The great English historian Buckle once said of the American Declaration of Independence:

In 1776 the Americans laid before Europe that noble declaration which ought to be hung up in the nursery of every king and blazoned on the porch of every royal palace.

The free nations of the North Atlantic area lay before the nations of the world a noble declaration that no armed aggressor, no swaggering conqueror, no military despot shall invade the North Atlantic area. That challenge shall be hung up in the nursery of every aggressor and blazoned on the porch of every totalitarian master. The North Atlantic area is dedicated to peace. "Do not enter."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if it meets with the approval of the Senate majority leader, the senior Senator from Michigan would prefer to speak tomorrow, although he is very anxious to facilitate the proceedings. However, if the majority leader so requests, I shall proceed at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I realize the position in which the Senator from Michigan finds himself. I desire very much to afford him any opportunity he may desire in connection with the statement he will make, because I know it is important not only to this Nation, but to the world.

There are nominations on the Executive Calendar which we might consider. It is my understanding that there will be objections to some of the nominations. It will probably require some little time to discuss them. I feel that they are important enough to be considered as soon as is possible. I had hoped, however, that some Senator in opposition might have something to say in reply to the excellent speech of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest that the wishes of the Senator from Michigan be observed.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Texas, and of course I intend to do so. But if any Senator desires to speak with reference to the North Atlantic Pact or to propound

any inquiries to the Senator from Texas, it should be done at this time. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] indicated a moment ago that he might have some inquiries to make.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. In response to the Senator from Illinois, I do not desire to enter into any extended discussion. The Senator from Texas made reference to 12 signatories and their democratic tendencies, or words to that effect. My only question was whether he meant to include Portugal within that list. That is the question I desire to ask at this time. I understood the Senator from Texas to state at the conclusion of his remarks that he would respond to the inquiry which I made. I cannot from memory quote his precise remarks with exactitude, but he made some reference to the 12 signatories to the pact.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator referred in some way to them in connection with a remark which he made about democracies. I wanted him to tell us, if he would, whether or not he considered that one of those signatories, namely, the Government of Portugal, was a democracy. I think the question of importance both because of the statement of the Senator and because the preamble to the North Atlantic Treaty contains the sentence:

They—

That is to say, the signatories—are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law.

So my question is as to whether or not the Senator from Texas places Portugal in the category of a democracy?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that he did not quite understand what I said in my remarks. The Senator from Missouri refers to the language of the preamble. I said:

The Committee on Foreign Relations has just completed a systematic and painstaking study of the treaty, and now I present it for the consideration and, I hope, the overwhelming approval of the Senate. * * * We urge its ratification at an early date. The treaty is a defensive pact. In it the 12 signatory nations—

Then I name them all, and Portugal is among the number—

undertake to exercise their inherent right of collective or individual self-defense against an armed attack, in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. DONNELL. Pardon me. The statement to which I referred occurred later than that in the Senator's remarks.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know the particular language to which the Senator refers.

Mr. DONNELL. Without reference to the particular language, will the Senator from Texas tell us whether he considers that the present Government of Portugal, the one whose representative signed the Pact on April 4, is, according to the preamble of the North Atlantic Treaty founded on the principles of democracy?

Mr. CONNALLY. Probably I cannot satisfy the Senator on that point or on any other point he may raise; but Portugal evidently has quite the kind of government she wants. It is in existence. Portugal has had no serious difficulties with any of her neighbors. Portugal has not interfered in any international affairs, so far as I know. The people of Portugal are peaceful. They want law and order. That is what the North Atlantic Treaty is intended to secure. If we can have Portugal as a party to the treaty helping us to do that, Portugal may ultimately tend more nearly to approach the democratic ideal the Senator from Missouri has in mind.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his observation.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY— RESERVATION

Mr. WATKINS submitted a reservation intended to be proposed by him to the North Atlantic Treaty signed at Washington on April 4, 1949, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before taking up the nominations on the Executive Calendar, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

ECONOMIC AID TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate a publication submitted by the Department of State and the Economic Cooperation Administration with reference to economic aid to the Republic of Korea, concerning which legislation is now pending before the House of Representatives. I wish to invite particular attention to page 1 of that document which, as I understand, has been placed in the hands of each Member of the Senate, and to read the following quotations:

The Republic of Korea, with its 20,000,000 people, constitutes the only remaining foothold of democracy in the northern part of continental Asia. The area which it controls is, roughly, the southern half of the Korean peninsula, the northern half with approximately 10,000,000 population being under Communist rule.

Further on, in the third paragraph, the document goes on to say:

So long as democratic ideals survive and grow among this energetic population, and so long as their democratically chosen government demonstrates its stability and independence, there will exist in the minds of the people of vast adjacent areas a continuing challenge to the Communist ideology which has been imposed upon them.

Further on I find the following statement:

The survival of democracy in Korea is of crucial importance also to the maintenance and further development of democracy in Japan.

I might say, parenthetically, Mr. President, that if the words "China (the non-Communist areas of China)" were substituted in each place in which the Department of State has mentioned Korea, I believe it would also be very much in point.

The document goes on to say:

The attainment of this goal requires, for a period, continuing understanding, moral support, and economic help from the United States.

On page 2 the importance of aid by the United States to the Republic of Korea is pointed out for the reasons stated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a very interesting interview which appears in today's issue of the Washington Daily News, by Clyde Farnsworth, of the Scripps-Howard staff, under the date line of Taipei, Formosa, July 5. It is an interview with the generalissimo with reference to the situation in China and the importance of preserving a non-Communist area of China not only for the future peace and security of the rest of the world, but for the future peace and security of the United States.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIANG APPEALS FOR UNITED STATES AID (By Clyde Farnsworth)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA, July 5.—Chiang Kai-shek broke his long silence today to declare his continued revolutionary leadership of the Chinese people, to appeal to the United States for support against communism, and to accuse the Soviet Union as a treaty breaker bent upon world domination.

The 62-year-old Generalissimo, who retired from the presidency of China last January but who has retained and strengthened his leadership of the Kuomintang Party, received another American reporter and myself in a joint interview which may portend his imminent return to active leadership.

It is reliably reported, though not confirmed by the Generalissimo, that he will go to Canton this week for a session of the Kuomintang's policy council, of which he is director general.

Chiang seemed in the best of health and spirits. He chatted with us in polite brevity and reserved nearly all his statements for publication to written answers which had been prepared to questions submitted in advance.

YES

Chiang's answers included his firmest language for publication thus far on the relation of the Soviet Union to Chinese communism. With the simple quote "yes" he answered the following questions:

Do you feel that if the Communist forces aren't now checked in China the Communist movement will spread throughout Asia?

Do you believe this spreading Communist movement is part of a plan of the Soviet Union to dominate the entire Far East in a campaign eventually to dominate the entire world?

The Generalissimo also had been asked to what extent the Chinese Communists serve the aims and interests of the Soviet Union and what he considered those to be in China, Asia, and the world at large. He replied:

"I would advise all persons interested in this question to read a document called The

Thesis of the Revolutionary Movement in Colonies and Semi-Colonies adopted at the sixth world congress of the Communist international December 12, 1928.

BLUEPRINT REALIZED

"This is a blueprint of Communist revolutionary activities in all Asia, now being realized step by step," Chiang continued. "Lenin stated that the road to the conquest of Europe lies through Asia. This policy of the founder of international communism is now being pursued by his faithful followers," he added.

Question. "Is there any chance in your opinion that Chinese communism can or will develop along separatist nationalist lines, irresponsive to the main currents of the international Communist drive toward world revolution? Is Mao Tsetung a puppet or a free agent? Can he be another Tito?"

Answer. "By the very pronouncement of the Chinese Communist leaders, as well as by the history of their party, there is nothing to indicate whatsoever that the Communist Party in China may break with the center of international communism, the Cominform, as Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia apparently did.

"The Communist Party in China has on many occasions placed on record its full support of the Cominform against Marshal Tito. By resolution of the whole party it approved the expulsion of Yugoslavia by the Cominform. The latest proof is to be found in published articles by Liu Shao-chi, chief of the organization department, and often called the second in command of the Communist Party in China. These articles denounced Tito as a 'traitor' who joined the capitalist camp. Further, in all those articles, Liu Shao-chi called on the proletariat in all countries to unite and join forces with the Soviet Union and eastern Europe 'to inflict defeat on the plans of the American imperialists.'

NO BREAK WITH MOSCOW

"Any suggestion that the Chinese Communists might break with Moscow is insidious propaganda, designed to confuse. Many years ago, Communists used to say that the Communists in China weren't real Communists at all but merely agrarian reformers. They succeeded in confusing and misleading many people to their own advantage.

"This talk of Chinese Communists possibly taking a Tito turn is just one more of their propaganda tricks designed to mislead and will prove as false and unfounded as their previous efforts to confuse.

"If Communists are permitted to dominate China, her relations with the outside world would be the same as those of other countries now behind the iron curtain. They couldn't possibly be any different."

NOT TOO LATE

Question. "There has been recently a great growth of concern abroad over the trend of events in China but with it also has grown a fatalistic conviction among many that the situation in China already is beyond repair and that Communist conquest of China and perhaps all Asia must run its course. Is it already too late for the United States to help? Will it ever be too late?"

Answer. "The area and population under Japanese occupation after 1 year of the war of resistance in 1938. That war, as you know, went on for seven more years until victory was won.

"The erroneous impression that the present situation is beyond repair has been created by Communist propaganda in disseminating defeatism. It is my conviction that all struggles for human freedom and national independence as against the tyranny of foreign domination must succeed. I do not believe that efforts—either our own efforts or efforts of friendly countries—to save the situation in China will be too late.

"However, if timely help is not given in China's anti-Communist fight, the price to

be paid by democratic countries in the future will be beyond comprehension. If communism is not checked in China it will spread over the whole of Asia. Should that occur, another world war would be inevitable.

"In view of this and of the responsibility of democratic countries toward all peace-loving peoples, I must point out that further loss of time in checking communism in China is dangerous."

REIGN OF TERROR

Question. "Have the Communists won, or can they ever win, mass support of the Chinese people in the areas of their military control? Do you believe that the nationalist government commands popular support there or in areas still beyond Communist conquest? If the Communists do not have popular support, what are the chief causes of the government's set-back?"

Answer. "A reign of terror is holding people in submission in Communist-held areas. Instead of popular support, hatred of people for the Communists is increasing. The Communists themselves have openly admitted that peasant uprisings have occurred and recurred in all areas under their control.

"People under Communist rule are all hoping for early restoration of the authority of the national government. It is a matter of record that large numbers of teachers, students, peasants, and others have fled into government areas despite the difficulties and dangers attending such flights. With the exception of a small number of political opportunists, no one cares to live under the Communist regime.

"As regards the causes for the set-back of the government, other than military, there are two: First, nonfulfillment by the U. S. S. R. of her obligations under the Chinese-Russian Treaty of 1945, which was based upon the Yalta agreement. In spite of this sacrifice on our part, Russia hasn't observed her treaty obligations. This hasn't only prevented restoration of Manchuria to China but has also enabled the Chinese Communists to develop a tremendous military force there.

"The second cause is economic. After the sufferings and tribulations sustained by the Chinese people in 8 years of war against aggression, the country has been further impoverished by the rebellion of the Communists.

"As a result all the Chinese people, such as teachers, public servants, and soldiers have been compelled to live many years below the subsistence line. Many political ills have arisen out of this deteriorating economic situation.

HOW CAN CHINA WIN?

Question. "How can China win this new war of resistance? What help does she require? Can the national government survive without foreign help? Do you expect a third world war?"

Answer. "The first step, it seems to me, is for the United States to reactivate its policy of giving moral support to the Chinese Government in its fight against communism.

"This fight against communism in China isn't only a fight for Chinese freedom from the present Communist menace. It is a fight for the peace and security of the free world, which doubtless is the very principle pursued by the United States in other parts of the world.

"The present Communist menace to China is a legacy of the last world war. I take it that the United States with which we fought together and bled together in that war will not be indifferent to what is going on in China.

"Nor by her assumption of world leadership in the fight against communism will the United States exclude China from the scope of her aid. Otherwise the future of the fight by the democratic countries against communism will be gloomy indeed and a calamity for mankind will be irretrievable."

NO NEGOTIATED PEACE

Question. "Is there even the slightest possibility now of a negotiated peace with the Communists?"

Answer. "From our experience with dealing with Communists for 25 years we have learned that it is impossible for any one to reach a settlement with Communists. On this question there is no difference of opinion among members of the Kuomintang or of the government. I shall do my utmost to strengthen the solidarity of the Kuomintang in the fight against communism."

CHIANG'S ROLE

Question. "How do you construe your own present or future role in this struggle for China? Under what condition, if any, would you return to active leadership of the nation?"

Answer. "Since my succession to the revolutionary leadership of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, upon his death, I have dedicated my life to the cause of the freedom and independence of the Chinese people. In that role I shall continue to carry out this important trust. With world communism threatening to conquer China and destroy her independence and historic civilization, I consider it my duty to do everything I can in rallying all forces to fight against it.

"Regardless of whether I hold any political office, I cannot give up my revolutionary leadership. That is to say, as long as independence of the nation and freedom of the people are not achieved, I cannot shirk my responsibility of carrying on the struggle."

Chiang received us in the mountainside guest house of the Formosa provincial government at Tsaoshan, about 10 miles from Taipei. He asked us to convey his earnest best wishes to President Truman, and as one of the correspondents was from Tokyo, he asked that his felicitations also be passed on to Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from California believe that if all China goes under the communistic rule and the northern part of Korea stays under the communistic rule, it will be possible for the southern part of Korea to remain a republic, or to practice the principles of democracy as we understand them?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I not only believe that it will not be possible for the southern half of Korea, which is the Korean Government recognized by the United States and by the other western powers, set up under the general auspices of the United Nations, to retain its freedom, but very likely it will not be possible for any other nation, not even excepting India, permanently to maintain itself outside of the Communist orbit if all of China goes behind the iron curtain.

Furthermore, it is the belief of the junior Senator from California that, because of the normal economic ties of the islands of Japan and the other island nations in the far Pacific, if all the continent of Asia goes behind the iron curtain it will be very difficult for these island nations to maintain themselves. So far as Japan is concerned, her normal ties of commerce and trade are with the continent of Asia, and unless the Government of the United States is prepared to underwrite permanently its economic and military support, Japan will probably ultimately be forced into the Communist orbit.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not the last answer in line with what General MacArthur has indicated in his request for further troops, even at the present time, to maintain the situation in Japan?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is not only indicative of what has been expressed by the Supreme Commander in Japan, but what has been indicated by other competent military officials who have had access to information as to conditions in the Far East.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield, in order that we might understand a little better what the Senator has in mind by our underwriting the military forces in China?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. In what he states about financial and military support to China, what does the Senator have in mind the United States Government should do in this matter specifically? Does the Senator contemplate the use of American armed forces in resisting the Communist forces in China?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If I may answer the second question first, the Senator from California does not contemplate the use of American armed forces in China any more than we have used American armed forces in Greece, where a similar situation of civil war has prevailed. But we did feel that it was of sufficient importance to the western world, and to the advance of the United States under the so-called Truman doctrine, not only to render financial and military support to Greece, but also to send a mission there to see that the equipment was adequately used.

If that situation is important in a country which contains, we will say, roughly 15,000,000 people, as there are in Greece, then it seems to me it is of equal importance, if not a great deal more important, to be sure that the entire nation of 450,000,000 people in China does not go into the Communist orbit. Even with all the advances which have already been made by the Communists in China, there is still outside the iron curtain at the moment a nation of more than 200,000,000 people, in an area which, from the point of view of terrain, is easier to defend than were the northern plains.

The testimony of General Chennault before the Committee on Armed Services indicated that it was his judgment that if those who were non-Communists in the western provinces were furnished with a relatively small amount of small arms, and perhaps mortars and light mountain artillery, they could give a good account of themselves, and could keep their particular areas of China from being overrun, perhaps for a number of years, and by that time we certainly will have a better idea as to whether the so-called cold war is to level off or is to be something else.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator from California correctly, he does not contemplate the use of the armed forces of the United States in China in behalf of the Nationalist Government, but he contemplates a mission comparable to the military

mission which this country has in Greece today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Did we not at one time have a military mission in China supporting the Nationalist Government, and did that prove adequate to resist the Communist approach? And if I may ask another question along with that, did the Nationalist armies take the advice of the American military mission?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The subject is one which would entail a great deal more discussion than we have time for this afternoon, but we have had a number of military missions in China. During part of the war we had General Stilwell there, as the Senator knows, and he did not get along so well with the Government of China. Later we had General Wedemeyer, who commanded the respect of the Chinese Government and did get along well, and made a considerable amount of progress with them. But, as the Senator knows, he is now back in this country as Assistant Chief of Staff of the Army.

Later we had a mission, headed by General Barr, which was not comparable to the mission we have sent to Greece, because they were under definite wraps not to give certain types of advice to the Chinese Government. Nor did they have the facilities for seeing through to the end result the use to which the equipment was placed.

I have talked with some of those who have to do with the ECA, and some who have observed the use to which the ECA funds were put, and it is the general observation of those who have been in China that they were well supervised. If we could have that type of supervision in the field of the military equipment which is given, I feel certain that the Chinese Government would welcome the same type of military mission, with the same type of supervision we are now exercising in Greece.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator has indicated, then, that he has in mind only a military mission, to perform functions comparable to those performed by the military mission of the United States in Greece, and that he does not contemplate the use of military personnel. Secondly, the able Senator has indicated, I believe, that he contemplates our furnishing equipment to the nationalist forces.

I wish to ask the able Senator if he has the information which was disclosed to the Committee on Foreign Relations—I shall not go into the details of it—by our diplomats and military representatives in China, as to the rate of the surrender to the Communist forces of the equipment which we sent to the nationalist armies, indicating that the rate of surrender far exceeded, over a given period, the volume of our shipments to them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was privileged, as a result of the kindness of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to read the testimony, and I shall not go into it because it was given in executive session, but I do say that I dispute a good many of the statements which were presented to the committee, the inference being given

that approximately 90 percent of the American aid which has been furnished to China since VJ-day has fallen into Communist hands. I say that statement cannot be supported by the record, in fact, it is not correct, and can be demonstrated as not being correct on the basis of the State Department's own figures.

Mr. PEPPER. I desired to ascertain what the Senator had in mind, and I thank him for the information he has given.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aiken | Hunt | Myers |
| Anderson | Ives | Neely |
| Bricker | Johnson, Colo. | O'Connor |
| Butler | Johnston, S. C. | O'Mahoney |
| Byrd | Kefauver | Pepper |
| Cain | Kem | Reed |
| Chapman | Kerr | Robertson |
| Chavez | Kilgore | Russell |
| Connally | Knowland | Saltonstall |
| Cordon | Langer | Schoeppel |
| Donnell | Long | Smith, N. J. |
| Douglas | Lucas | Sparkman |
| Downey | McCarran | Stennis |
| Eaton | McCarthy | Taft |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Flanders | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Frear | McGrath | Thye |
| Fulbright | McKellar | Tobey |
| Gillette | McMahon | Tydings |
| Graham | Malone | Vandenberg |
| Green | Miller | Watkins |
| Hayden | Millikin | Wherry |
| Hendrickson | Morse | Wiley |
| Hickenlooper | Mundt | Williams |
| Hoey | Murray | Withers |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). A quorum is present.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senate is in executive session, considering the North Atlantic Treaty. There are some nominations on the Executive Calendar which have been passed over. It is rather important than those nominations be considered at the earliest possible time. I should like to ask about the nomination of W. Walton Butterworth, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of State. His nomination has been favorably reported. Can we not consider that nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There are two or three Senators interested in that nomination, one of whom is not present this afternoon. If it is agreeable to the distinguished majority leader, I should like to have the nomination passed over at least until another executive session is held. By that time, if there is any further objection, I shall communicate with the majority leader, and then, at his pleasure, the nomination can be considered and debated at length. I ask the majority leader if he will consent to passing over the nomination until one particular Senator, at least, can be present and take part in the debate.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire if the same request would apply to the nomination

of Ellis O. Briggs to be Ambassador to Czechoslovakia, and the nomination of Nathaniel P. Davis to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Hungary?

Mr. WHERRY. That is true so far as today is concerned. I am sure that there is no objection to the consideration of the nomination of Mrs. Perle Mesta to be Minister to Luxemburg.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the able minority leader and other Members of the Senate that the next time the Executive Calendar is called it will be necessary for us to consider the three nominations which we are now passing over. I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator from Nebraska by passing over the nominations of Mr. Butterworth, Mr. Briggs, and Mr. Davis at this time, and taking up for consideration the nomination of Mrs. Perle Mesta, of Rhode Island, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxemburg.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the able majority leader.

NOMINATION OF MRS. PERLE MESTA TO BE MINISTER TO LUXEMBURG

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Mrs. Perle Mesta, of Rhode Island, to be Minister to Luxemburg.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection.

The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Perle Mesta to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxemburg.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished majority leader whether or not there would be objection to this course of procedure: I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, or some spokesman for that committee, a few questions in regard to Mrs. Mesta, and then I should like to address the Senate in regard to the nomination. May we have unanimous consent that, in advance of any remarks, I may have the benefit of asking a few questions of some representative of the Committee on Foreign Relations who is informed with respect to this nomination?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] asked me to represent him while he is at lunch. I shall do my best to answer the questions of the Senator from Missouri, but I am not quite so well informed as is the Senator from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Texas is not present, it seems to me that probably the best course to pursue is for the Senator from Missouri to proceed with the remarks which he desires to make. Then when the Senator from Texas returns to

the Chamber, he will be in a position to answer the Senator's questions. I will see that the Senator from Texas is notified, so that he can be present at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. DONNELL. That is entirely agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I think perhaps it would be a little more logical, from my standpoint, to have the benefit of the answers to my questions before I speak, because my remarks, at least in part, would be based upon answers which might develop from the questions. However, I shall endeavor to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I believe that members of the subcommittee which handled the nomination are present. I think probably they could answer the Senator's questions.

Mr. DONNELL. To which Senator should I address my questions?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I may say that the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] and the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are both present. No doubt both are familiar with the situation. I am sure they can answer any questions the Senator from Missouri desires to ask.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes; that will be very fine.

If the senior Senator from Rhode Island will be kind enough to address himself to this matter I should like to ask him a few questions.

In the first place, before asking him the questions, I may say that the nomination of Mrs. Perle Mesta to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxemburg was presented to the Senate by the representative of the President on June 21. Action upon her nomination was taken by the Foreign Relations Committee, according to a transcript of the proceedings which I hold in my hand, 1 week later, on June 28. In due time the nomination was reported to the Senate, and is now before us for consideration.

I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island what study or examination was made by the Foreign Relations Committee with respect to the qualifications of Mrs. Mesta to be a diplomatic representative of the United States?

Mr. GREEN. It is not usual to have any special examination made when the person is fairly well known. The nomination is made after such an examination by the State Department and the President. He offers the nomination; and unless there is some objection, we usually believe, and act on the belief, that the President has the right to choose his own representatives in the Foreign Service.

If there were any objections from any source, of course such objections would be investigated. But in this case there were none.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in my understanding, then, that the Foreign Relations Committee made no study or examination with respect to the qualifications of Mrs. Mesta to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to Luxemburg?

Mr. GREEN. We made no special investigation or discussion of the matter. She is well known, and her nomination is well known.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the committee make any investigation whatsoever, so far as the Senator from Rhode Island knows?

Mr. GREEN. We made no special investigation. I do not know how the Senator would define the term.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Rhode Island has used the phrase "no special investigation." I should like to know whether any investigation at all was made.

Mr. GREEN. I simply used the word "special" in order to cover any differences of opinion as to the meaning of the word "investigation." According to my information, there was none.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Was any study undertaken, by either the subcommittee or the full committee, regarding her qualifications?

Mr. GREEN. Not that I know of.

Mr. DONNELL. Who constituted the subcommittee upon her nomination?

Mr. GREEN. I do not know that there was one.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood the Senator from Utah to say a moment ago that there was a subcommittee and that the members of the subcommittee could answer these questions. Or did I incorrectly understand the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I used the word "subcommittee." I understood there was a sponsor of Mrs. Mesta before the Foreign Relations Committee. When I used that word, I used it very loosely. The Senator knows that the clerk of the committee refers nominations to various Senators, and certain Senators become sponsors of the nominee. Senators either approve or disapprove. If they approve, they become sponsors. It was in that sense that I used that term.

Mr. DONNELL. Is the senior Senator from Rhode Island the sponsor to whom the Senator from Utah referred?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I understood that the Senators from Rhode Island were sponsors, in the sense that I used that term. I do not know anything about whether they recommended Mrs. Mesta to the President. Of course, that is the President's own affair.

But everyone who has presided over a Senate committee knows that whenever a name comes up for confirmation the State from which the nominee comes is always listed, and the clerk of the committee almost always, as a matter of form, refers the nomination to the two Senators from that State.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator, who has served with distinction as the chairman of more than one committee, and is now chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, whether it is the practice, at least in

the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in connection with appointments of real consequence—such as, for instance, the recent appointment of the Commissioner of Education—to have the appointee before the committee, for examination by the committee. Is not that the practice?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true; but in foreign relations there is quite a difference, as the Senator knows. An ambassador is the representative of the President abroad, as well as a representative of this country. It is true that Senate confirmation is required. In that way we carry out the spirit of our democracy. That is all.

But the President is very free in appointing ambassadors and ministers, freer, probably, than in the case of any other nominations.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to quote this sentence from Mr. J. Rives Childs' recent work on American Foreign Service:

A minister is accredited to the chief of state, but does not represent the person of the President.

Does the Senator disagree with that observation?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I certainly do disagree; and if I were writing that textbook I would say he does represent the chief of state, regardless of whether it is a democracy, an autocracy, or what not, because the President can call him home without asking anyone about it. So it seems to me that if such a person can be hired and fired, he is pretty much a representative of the person who hires and fires him.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, with respect to Mr. Childs, from whose book I have just quoted, I may say that today he is the Ambassador of the United States to Saudi Arabia, having been elevated to that post only a few weeks ago by the President, with confirmation by the Senate, I believe.

At the time when this work was written, he then was serving as United States Minister to Saudi Arabia and our Minister to Yemen. He is described by Joseph C. Grew, former United States Ambassador to Japan and former Assistant Secretary of State, as—

a distinguished officer of the Foreign Service. I have known Mr. Childs for many years and have respected and admired his work.

That is the book from which I was quoting a moment ago.

Mr. President, now I wish to ask the Senator whether Mrs. Mesta was called before the Foreign Relations Committee for examination?

Mr. GREEN. No; she was not.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator whether this short memorandum of minutes of the meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a correct transcript of what transpired on Tuesday, June 28, 1949, namely, 1 week after the nomination of Mrs. Mesta:

NOMINATIONS

TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 1949

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the committee hearing

room, United States Capitol, Senator TOM CONNALLY (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators CONNALLY (chairman), GEORGE, THOMAS of Utah, PEPPER, GREEN, FULBRIGHT, VANDENBERG, and LODGE.

The CHAIRMAN. At Senator GREEN's insistence, we will take up the nomination of Mrs. Perle Mesta.

It is your motion to confirm her?

Senator GREEN. I make that motion; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. All in favor of the nomination of Mrs. Mesta will say "Aye." Opposed, "No." She is confirmed.

Senator GREEN. As Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg. Senator LODGE. Have we ever had an Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think so. Usually the Ambassador to Belgium handles that.

Let the clerk note particularly that we had a quorum present.

Whereupon the hearing was adjourned.

Is that a correct transcript, according to the Senator's best recollection?

Mr. GREEN. I do not know whether it is a correct transcript, because I did not see the original record. But it is in accord with the facts.

Mr. DONNELL. It is in accord with the facts?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mrs. Mesta is from the Senator's home State; is she not?

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. She lives at Newport?

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Is the Senator able to tell us what schools Mrs. Mesta attended and in what subjects she specialized while at those schools?

Mr. GREEN. No. I did not know Mrs. Mesta at that time.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator know what schools she attended?

Mr. GREEN. I answered the Senator no; I did not.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator know whether any member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee knew, when this evidence was taken on June 28?

Mr. GREEN. I do not know what other members knew.

Mr. DONNELL. I want to be perfectly fair by stating that Dr. Wilcox, of the Foreign Relations Committee, at my request gave me a memorandum. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether he ever saw a memorandum entitled "Mrs. Perle Mesta."

Mr. GREEN. I do not know that I ever saw it, because I cannot see it now.

Mr. DONNELL. I will show it to the Senator. [Handing a memorandum to Mr. GREEN.] I want this back.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, under what rule is the Senator from Missouri conducting his inquisition and calling upon Members to testify as witnesses relative to the presidential appointment now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no rule of the Senate that permits it, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. DONNELL. That request, Mr. President, was made by myself and was granted, as I understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not so understand.

Mr. DONNELL. I now make the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will be glad to put the request.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask unanimous consent further to continue the investigation of this matter as I am now proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. NEELY. I object to the Senator's instituting police court methods of procedure in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. GREEN. Does the Senator from Missouri wish me to read the memorandum?

Mr. DONNELL. There has been an objection made by a Senator on the Democratic side. I am glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I am quite willing to have the responsibility for the objection charged either to the Democratic side of the aisle or to me. The Senate shall not become a police court with my consent. I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor. Objection is heard to the colloquy. The Senator from Missouri may yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, regarding the memorandum, I will state to the Senate, at my request, on the inquiry as to whether there was a memorandum of this kind, it being true in at least one or more committees of which I have been a member that we usually have a memorandum of this kind before us, Dr. Wilcox, of the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, was kind enough to furnish me with the memorandum. I read it:

MRS. PERLE MESTA

Born, New York, N. Y., 1891; educated in private schools in Galveston, Tex.; graduate of Sherwood School of Music, Chicago; member of the Business and Professional Women's Party; member of the National Women's Party; member of the board for the Home for Incurables, Washington, D. C.; delegate from the States of Arizona and Rhode Island to the national conventions, 1944 and 1948; owned and operated ranch in Arizona; former member of the board of the Mesta Machine Tools Co., Pittsburgh; outstanding work in social and philanthropic endeavors; legal resident of Rhode Island.

That was furnished to me, as I have stated, by Dr. Wilcox. Mr. President, inasmuch as objection has been heard to the inquest by myself, I shall proceed. But I should like to inquire if there is any objection to my asking the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island a question or two in regard to the political services rendered, if any, by Mrs. Mesta.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent that he may interrogate the junior Senator from Rhode Island with

reference to some matter. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether or not it is a fact that in 1946 Mrs. Mesta contributed funds toward aiding President Truman to purge Roger C. Slaughter in the congressional campaign in Missouri? Does the Senator know whether or not that is a fact?

Mr. McGRATH. I was not the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee at that time, so I do not know anything about that matter.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator whether or not he knows anything as to the correctness of this statement in *Time* magazine of March 14, 1949:

Perle is go-getting and able in her own way. She is a money raiser extraordinary. At Harry Truman's request, she hustled her check book out to Kansas City in 1946, saved the day for his campaign to purge his hometown Congressman, Roger Slaughter.

Does the Senator know of that?

Mr. McGRATH. Not of my own knowledge. But if there were a contribution which came to the Democratic National Committee it would be found recorded in the records of that committee as filed with the House of Representatives.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. May I ask the Senator, if there is no objection, a further question or two with respect to Mrs. Mesta's contributions to the party?

Mr. McGRATH. I may say that her contributions to the party have been extraordinary and magnificent, and undoubtedly—

Mr. DONNELL. Could the Senator tell us what, in dollars and cents, the contributions of Mrs. Mesta were?

Mr. McGRATH. No. I do not keep personal track of them.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator have a recollection as to approximately the amount of the contributions?

Mr. McGRATH. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator know whether it ran into the thousands of dollars?

Mr. McGRATH. I would not know that. But I am sure it would probably be in excess of \$1,000.

Mr. DONNELL. I might ask also whether the Senator knows if this statement in *Time* magazine of March 14, 1949, is true:

As cochairman of last year's Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners, she raised \$250,000, kept at it dogtightly during the campaign. Declared Louis Johnson, chairman of the Democratic finance committee: "When our crowd got discouraged, Perle Mesta would—

May I give the exact language?—

raise hell. She called us men of little faith. She was a tonic for us"—"our little pepper-upper."

Does the Senator know whether or not the remarks represent the facts, as he knows them?

Mr. McGRATH. I think the Senator from Missouri is as good a judge as I am of the truth and veracity of *Time* magazine. He can judge that for himself. I can say Mrs. Mesta did magnificent work in connection with the af-

fairs of the Democratic Party, particularly the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners which were held in 1948, and she did so again this year. She was an aid, an encouragement to all of us on both those occasions. I may say that in the Washington dinner where she worked most diligently in 1949, our party raised by that dinner in the neighborhood of \$300,000, and she is entitled to a great deal of the credit for the total result.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator, could he tell from whom the information could be obtained as to the total amount of her contribution to the Democratic National Committee?

Mr. McGRATH. It can be obtained from the reports filed with the House of Representatives quarterly by the Democratic National Committee, which I can assure the Senator are correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. May I ask the Senator also, inasmuch as Mrs. Mesta is from Rhode Island, whether he has had occasion to examine into her qualifications to serve in the position or office of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg?

Mr. McGRATH. I made no particular examination of Mrs. Mesta's qualifications. I would not be required to, because I know her so well. I have had such experience with her in the fields of political action, that my sense of values would immediately tell me without further investigation that she was eminently qualified to represent our Nation in the country to which she is being accredited. Mrs. Mesta has been a legal resident of Rhode Island for only a few years, and I have only known her since she came there. I have had no occasion to look into her formal education.

Mr. DONNELL. Could the Senator tell us what experience she has had which in his judgment would qualify her to act as United States minister to a foreign country?

Mr. McGRATH. She is a woman of rather vast business experience. She has managed a rather sizable fortune which came to her through the untimely death of her husband. She has managed it probably as well as anybody in the United States could manage such a business enterprise, and I think her reputation is generally known in that regard. She is a woman of good judgment. She is a woman of fine tact and diplomacy, and to my way of appraising her, I believe she has the qualifications which are necessary for this position.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am concerned with this question as to whether Mrs. Mesta possesses the qualifications essential to performance of the duties of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg. I am not unmindful of the fact that Luxembourg is a small country, and I shall have something more to say about that in a few moments. But, nevertheless, the office to which this lady has been appointed is one of the outstanding offices, namely, the representative of the United States of America in a foreign country, and at a time when representation of this Nation may reasonably be expected to require the

knowledge and qualifications which would be normally necessary, to say the least, if not more than normally, in the performance of the duties of such an office.

I have referred, earlier this afternoon, to the book which I hold in my hand. It is not an old book. Its date of copyright is in 1948. The introduction by former Ambassador Joseph C. Grew is dated March 19, 1947, and the book and its author speak for themselves. As I have indicated, the author of it, Mr. Childs, who, at the time of the writing of the book, was serving as American Minister to Saudi Arabia and was our representative to Yemen, is, so Mr. Grew says, a distinguished officer of the Foreign Service. He has passed through the grades of the service. I now quote from Mr. Grew:

The Honorable James Rives Childs, who is serving today as the American Minister to Saudi Arabia and our representative to Yemen, is a distinguished officer of the Foreign Service. I have known Mr. Childs for many years and have respected and admired his work.

He has passed through the grades of the service, having filled the positions of consul, second secretary, first secretary, counselor of legation, and consul general, and has served not only abroad but also in the Department of State. Among the posts to which he has been assigned are Jerusalem, Bucharest, Cairo, Teheran, and Tangier, his wide experience thus having given him a broad understanding of our service and its many ramifications.

Among other things, Mr. Grew says:

As long as able men such as Mr. Childs form the backbone of the Foreign Service, we shall be skillfully represented throughout the world, and I hope and believe that the service will continue to attract some of the best of America's young men.

Mr. President, I have quoted from this observation by Mr. Grew in connection with Mr. Childs because of a remark which Mr. Childs himself makes in this book, and which to my mind, is of great importance in our passing today upon the question whether the nomination of Mrs. Mesta should be confirmed.

At pages 64 and 65 of the book he has this to say:

All American Foreign Service officers are diplomats; all of them perform the four basic phases of diplomacy—representation, negotiation, reporting, and protection of American interests abroad. However, the work of Ambassadors and Ministers is not only more important—

I call attention to the word "Ministers," because that is the post for which Mrs. Mesta has been nominated. I read further—

it is more evenly divided among the four phases. A vice-consul has relatively little representation to perform—unless he is in charge of a post. He may have little to do in the way of negotiation. His duties may lie almost exclusively in protecting American interests. An Ambassador or Minister will be occupied constantly with all four functions.

Those four functions, as I have read, are the functions of representation, negotiation, reporting, and protection of American interests abroad.

Mr. President, what is the importance of representation? I have referred to *Time* magazine. I think there is no harm

in saying at this point that Time magazine, from which I have quoted, with respect to Mrs. Mesta, refers to her as "the Capital's No. 1 hostess."

I have no doubt of the graciousness of Mrs. Mesta, the fine hospitality she has extended to many persons, and the credit which should be given to her for services of this type. But, Mr. President, what we are inquiring into this afternoon is not the question as to qualities of a social nature exclusively. I think that also enters into it to some extent. I think a man or woman who is to represent the United States should have something of the graciousness and the social qualities which doubtless Mrs. Mesta does possess. It has been my privilege on more than one occasion to come into contact with one of the other two distinguished ladies who have represented this country. I am referring to the daughter of William Jennings Bryan, Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde, who served with distinction in the diplomatic service, having qualities which I think qualified her. She served in the Congress of the United States before she served in a diplomatic position, and she possesses this graciousness to which reference has been made. I do not in any sense mean to detract from Mrs. Mesta by referring to the gracious qualities of a hostess or the cordiality and hospitality which she has extended in many cases. But Mr. Childs, a man of the experience and ability which he possesses, calls attention to the very important functions of a minister. He referred, as I have indicated, first to the matter of representation. I think it is one in which the qualities which Mrs. Mesta has demonstrated by acting as hostess are important. Mr. Childs points out that the contacts of a minister begin with representation. By representation he means what is indicated in the Government service.

It will be remembered that he stated an ambassador or a minister would be occupied constantly with all four functions, and that, in practice, there is not a great deal of difference between a minister and an ambassador. He says an ambassador is called upon to represent the United States at all ceremonial functions. I have no doubt that Mrs. Mesta possesses many of the qualities essential to representation. But Mr. Childs, after proceeding along the line of discussing representation, points out:

Through representation, the diplomat makes his first connections with his colleagues in other missions and with the government officials of the country of his assignment. But his connections with them cannot stop there. Nor can he limit his contacts to the persons who ceremony put in his way. To perform the functions of representation is to be introduced to a country—not to know it.

At page 69 he says:

So important did negotiations loom in the early days of diplomacy, that a foreign representative was known more commonly by the term "negotiator" than by that of diplomat. The functions of the diplomat have since been extended, but negotiation has not lessened in importance.

I shall point out in a few minutes something about what negotiation is and what an official publication of the United

States Government has to say with reference to it. I should like to read a little further from Mr. Childs' book on the question of the function of a minister along the line of negotiation. He says:

Cooperation between nations has always been based upon agreements. The increasing complexity and the wide extension of these relations in modern times has indeed vastly increased the work of negotiation of the foreign-service officer. Such work includes the drafting of a wide variety of bilateral and multilateral arrangements embodied in treaties, conventions, protocols, and other documents of a political, economic, and social nature. Their subject matter ranges from the creation of an international security organization, through territorial changes, establishment of rules to govern international civil aviation—

I pause at that point to say that it was my privilege to fly across Luxembourg some time ago. Negotiation along the line of aviation is a very practical and important feature of what may well be the duties of a minister.

I return to Mr. Childs' comments:

Their subject matter ranges from the creation of an international security organization, through territorial changes, establishment of rules to govern international civil aviation, shipping and telecommunications, and the adjustment of international commercial relationships, to such particular matters as immigration, double taxation, waterway rights, tourist travel, and exchange control. Almost—

I call particular attention to this sentence:

Almost the entire gamut of human activities is covered.

Continuing, he says:

While modern communications may have tended in some degree to limit the wide independence formerly enjoyed by the diplomatic negotiator, no mechanical substitute has yet been found for the interplay of human qualities which may make or mar the successful conclusion of an international contract. Whatever guidance the telephone or cable instruction may give, the conduct of negotiations still calls for training—

Training, Mr. President—

knowledge, precision, discernment, prudence, calm, patience, good temper, tact, and industry—the basic virtues of the diplomat.

So, Mr. President, we have some illustrations from the lips of a man who knows what he is talking about, from long experience, regarding what are the first functions of a foreign minister, namely, the function of representation, secondly, the function of negotiation.

Then he passes on to the importance of the function of reporting; that is to say, of being able to report back to his own government what has transpired, reporting what he sees, what he hears, and what has been said. Mr. Childs says:

The preservation and furtherance of American interests demand a clear and far-sighted understanding of American objectives, and the ability to report accurately and to appraise correctly the position and interests of the foreign country participating in the agreement. The most precisely drafted instructions of the Department of State will suffice little in advancing a negotiation if the Foreign Service officer is lacking in the personal attributes necessary to the successful diplomat.

Mr. President, I could read with profit, at least to myself, much more of this

book. I shall not read more of it in detail, though there are one or two things which I might mention.

Some of the Members of the Senate have had occasion to come in contact with the very busy office of a very large country over at Paris, France, the office of our Ambassador Caffery, whom many of my colleagues undoubtedly know. Mr. Childs points out in his book the program of a typical day in the life of that ambassador. He states:

It will be observed from the foregoing that a typical day in the life of Ambassador Caffery included all four phases of diplomacy; representation, negotiation, reporting, and the protection of American interests.

Someone may say, what does the protection of American interests mean? Mr. Childs had previously indicated the program that Mr. Caffery had followed, and he continues:

Mr. Frank L. Warrin, International Business Machines, calling to review the French economic and political situation for guidance in planning the future activities of his American company in France.

Mr. Childs says that the information which Mr. Caffery "gave to the representative of the International Business Machines Corp. comes within the last-named category."

These are the functions which Mr. Childs, in a modern, up-to-date book, and from a wealth of personal experience, indicates are the functions of a minister.

I wish to mention briefly also something another gentleman has said. I refer to Prof. Charles Cheney Hyde, professor at law, at least when he wrote the book, at Northwestern University. His book is entitled "International Law, Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States." In the book he has a chapter upon the rights and duties of ministers. Let me quote briefly what he says are the functions of a minister. He says, at page 764:

In the fulfillment of his mission an envoy finds that his duties generally possess a threefold aspect.

He had just finished a paragraph which I think I should in fairness to Mrs. Mesta call to the attention of the Senate. He said:

The function of a minister is to promote good relations between his own state and that to which he is accredited. His usefulness ceases, therefore, if for any reason he becomes persona non grata to the government of the latter, or in case enmity between the two countries banishes the desire for friendship and terminates diplomatic relations.

Then, Mr. President, after this generalization, which is undoubtedly true, and to which I think we will all agree, he points out:

In the fulfillment of his mission an envoy finds that his duties generally possess a threefold aspect. They concern, primarily, what pertains directly to his own country as a whole, such as the negotiation of treaties or the fostering of its political interests. They relate, secondly, to the welfare of private individuals, commonly and chiefly that of his own countrymen, who are within the state of his sojourn. They have to do, thirdly, with the special and technical requirements peculiar to his diplomatic office.

He proceeds in the next subdivision of his work to discuss this matter of the negotiation of treaties. He says:

To negotiate treaties is oftentimes the duty of a minister. However complete his instructions and however closely he may be in communication with his government, he should possess exact knowledge not only of the nature of and reasons for what he demands but also of the probable effect of compliance upon the other contracting party. With its existing conventional arrangements dealing with the same matter, he should have familiarity; and likewise, with whatsoever arguments it may have opposed to similar demands made by other states. Technical skill in the drafting of public agreements, clear understanding of the sense in which particular terms are employed, and a readiness to avoid the use of expressions likely to result in divergent constructions, are vital to the success of a minister who is burdened with the conclusion of a treaty.

I might read a little more here. He says:

In case proposed legislation appears to disregard the terms of an agreement already concluded with his country, it becomes the duty of the minister to ascertain the fact, and, pursuant to instructions, to lodge formal protest with the state to which he is accredited.

It is the constant duty of a minister to watch political and economic or other movements in the state of his official sojourn and to observe intelligently whatsoever significance they possess in relation to his own. Such conduct is not to be deemed necessarily adverse to the welfare of the country to which he is accredited. The stability of amicable relations between states depends in large degree upon the completeness with which their problems and aspirations are mutually understood and respected. Should, however, a minister employ improper means to gain a knowledge of local policies, his conduct, if known, would serve to impair his usefulness, and possibly lead to a demand for his recall.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I thoroughly agree with the logic of what the Senator is saying, but let me ask him one question. Can he point to any example of an upstanding American woman who has ever failed a public trust ever assigned to her?

Mr. DONNELL. I know of only two instances in which women have been accorded an honor of the type conferred on Mrs. Mesta, and I know they have rendered fine service. I refer to Mrs. Harri-man and Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde. But that does not mean at all that every woman, merely because she is a woman, is qualified to go into the diplomatic service of this country. I have all respect for womanhood—I believe it is proper to recognize womanhood—and I have no objection to a woman who is qualified by experience and by education and training to be chosen to any place within the gift of America or of any of its officials. But I do say that the mere fact that the person is a woman is no guaranty that she is qualified to carry on matters which require, obviously, a very particular type of training and study in order to make the person of utmost usefulness.

Mr. LONG. Would not the Senator agree that Mrs. Mesta has already proved herself to be a very outstanding woman?

Mr. DONNELL. I do not wish to make any statement here which might appear in any sense impolite or unjust, but I am going to answer the question frankly. So far as I can observe, no proof whatsoever has been brought before the Senate to show that Mrs. Mesta is qualified to perform the duties of the particular office to which she is chosen. It has been stated that she was educated in private schools in Galveston, Tex., without any indication whatsoever as to what they were, and how old she was when she was there. I may say, parenthetically, that from some of the evidence at hand I think she must have been quite young. In that evidence I see no indication what those schools were, or what she studied there, or what her major interests were. In the fact that she was a graduate of the Sherwood School of Music in Chicago, however deserving an institution that may be, I see nothing which would necessarily indicate that a person who had taken the course there was qualified to be a diplomat of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator agree with the statement appearing in Time magazine—I ask the question since he has quoted the article as an authority—that Mrs. Mesta is the outstanding hostess in Washington, D. C.?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have no knowledge other than hearsay of that. But I have no doubt that she is a very fine hostess. The article in Time magazine goes into some further detail along that line which is very interesting and informative.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator believe the knowledge and ability she has acquired from her activities as an outstanding hostess would prove of value to her in her position as a diplomatic representative of our country?

Mr. DONNELL. A person who is an outstanding hostess certainly possesses some admirable qualities. I have no doubt of that. Mrs. Mesta may possess many admirable qualities. I think, however, I have seen hosts and hostesses who would not be qualified to act as ministers of our country to foreign countries.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator mention some of the outstanding women hostesses who would not be qualified to assume an important diplomatic post?

Mr. DONNELL. I would not undertake to give a list of persons who would not be qualified for such a post. I think the Senator from Louisiana could do as well as I along that line. I shall not undertake to list the persons, hosts, hostesses or otherwise, who are not qualified for diplomatic posts. I take it we are not here this afternoon to confirm somebody simply because it is not proved that she is not qualified. I think the Senate of the United States is called upon here this afternoon to act upon the nomination of this lady on the basis of whether or not she is qualified; not upon whether she is not qualified. I do not know of any proof which is now before the Senate to show that the lady possesses the necessary qualifications.

I refer to an official publication of the United States. I have already quoted

from Mr. Childs and I have quoted from Prof. Charles Cheney Hyde. I now address myself to the booklet issued by the Secretary of State, that is to say, by the Department of State, prepared in the office of the Director General of the Foreign Service. It is dated January 1, 1947. I have later publications from that bureau, but I do not find anything therein with respect to this particular point. I call attention, however, that in this particular volume is given a series of statements of the functions of the Foreign Service.

I want to make it perfectly clear, Mr. President, that I have no doubt there are many functions, perhaps some of those I am going to read, perhaps many of them, which are confined more to the consular duties than to the ambassadorial or ministerial duties. Nevertheless, in view of what I have read from the two authorities from whom I have quoted with respect to the functions of negotiations, the functions of reporting, the functions of protection of American interests abroad, and the functions of representation of the United States, I deem it important to read from this publication issued by the State Department some of the important duties which must be performed by a minister representing our country abroad. I read from pages 4 and 5. On page 4 appears the following:

The Foreign Service of the United States in January 1947, numbered approximately 11,000 people, including ambassadors, ministers—

That is what Mrs. Mesta would be, a minister—

Foreign Service officers, Foreign Service reserve officers, Foreign Service staff officers and employees, alien clerks and employees, and consular agents. The Foreign Service represents the United States abroad—

That is along the line of Mr. Childs' reference to representation. Of course I take it, in fairness to what he was speaking of, the term "representation" related to ceremonial functions, but he spoke also of the protection of American interests abroad, as the Chair will recall. This official publication states:

The Foreign Service represents the United States abroad, interprets for its information and guidance events, situations, and opinions in the country to which the personnel is assigned, and endeavors to promote good will and common understanding.

The officers and employees of the Foreign Service protect the interests of the United States—

That is almost verbatim the language of Mr. Childs, his language being "protection of American interests abroad."

The officers and employees of the Foreign Service protect the interests of the United States in accordance with treaties and international law, and advise, protect, and assist American citizens resident, traveling, or having interests abroad. They seek to prevent or to correct practices which might discriminate against the United States or its citizens.

They negotiate treaties—

I call attention to the fact that obviously the writer of this official publication is referring here to ministers, because we have found out in Mr. Hyde's

book that the negotiation of treaties is among the important functions.

They negotiate treaties, conventions, and protocols regarding international intercourse, tariffs, shipping, commerce, and the preservation of the peace in conformity and in accordance with the instructions of the Secretary of State and the President. They observe, analyze, and report on political, social, and economic conditions and trends of significance in the country in which they are assigned. Some major subjects of these reports are legislative programs, public opinion, market conditions, trade statistics, finance, production, labor, agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining, natural resources, shipping, freights, charters, legislation, tariffs, and laws.

One of the important functions of the Foreign Service is the promotion and protection of the foreign trade of the United States. Trade inquiries, trade disputes, and market conditions are the subject of numerous communications. Miscellaneous inquiries on a wide variety of subjects are answered.

Then another half page is devoted to other Foreign Service functions, with which I shall not burden the Senate.

I desire to make it perfectly clear that undoubtedly, in my judgment, some of the various functions I have read are of a consular nature, but obviously, from the very wording of what I have previously read, numerous of these important functions, such as negotiations of treaties, and the preservation and protection of American interests abroad, are the functions of a minister, namely, the position to which Mrs. Mesta has been appointed.

Mr. President, what are her qualifications? So far as I know her only qualifications are those I have read. No, I think I should add—and I shall not read it in detail, unless the Senate desires it—that *Time* magazine points out something of her travels during her marriage to Mr. Mesta. I believe the writer in *Time* magazine says she was in Europe 22 times. I think that is a distinct asset in her favor. The writer tells about her experience in connection with the ranch in Arizona which she bought, but disposed of because she thought it was too lonely in that region. Also about her owning a home in Rhode Island. I think that was disposed of, as I recall. But, Mr. President, her various activities, such as her services upon charitable boards, regardless of how commendable they are, regardless of how praiseworthy they may be, do not, without further explanation, without further demonstration or certainly far more investigation than the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, with all due respect to that body, gave to it, demonstrate the qualification of Mrs. Mesta to act in this important capacity.

Mr. President, it would appear to me to be perfectly clear that the only consideration at least officially, which was given by the Foreign Relations Committee to Mrs. Mesta's nomination was the following:

The CHAIRMAN. At Senator GREEN's insistence we will take up the nomination of Mrs. Perle Mesta. Is it your motion to confirm her?

Senator GREEN. I make that motion; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. All in favor of the nomination of Mrs. Mesta will say "Aye." Opposed, "No." She is confirmed, Senator GREEN, as

Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Luxemburg.

Then follows the inquiry by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], as follows:

Have we ever had an Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Luxemburg?

To which the chairman answered:

I do not think so. Usually the Ambassador to Belgium handled that.

Then follows the observation by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Let the clerk note particularly that we had a quorum present.

I would say that that does not to my mind demonstrate the possession of sufficient qualifications to justify the confirmation of the nomination of this lady.

Mr. President, the Senate will doubtless recall that the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] on June 24 spoke with respect to Mrs. Mesta. His observations are to be found at page 8291. He gave his opinion with respect to her. The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] likewise made some observations. The Senator from North Dakota said:

Mr. LANGER. I am delighted at the attitude taken by the distinguished Senator from Maine. I might say that Mrs. Mesta comes from the western section of the country. She lived for a long time in the State of Oklahoma. She is a very democratic woman. Not only that, but I think she is perhaps as well acquainted with people who have come to the United States from foreign countries, and have been the guests of our Government, as perhaps any woman in the United States. I am delighted at the attitude of the Senator, and I hope Mrs. Mesta's nomination will be confirmed by the unanimous vote of the Senate, as I believe it should be.

I am not unmindful of these comments made by the two distinguished and highly regarded Members of this body. Yet, Mr. President, I for one am not yet convinced that it has been demonstrated to this body—which has some responsibility in the matter—that she possesses the appropriate qualifications.

The Congress of the United States has given considerable study within the past few years to the subject of Foreign Service. Have we forgotten—I take it we have not—the fact that in 1946 we passed the Foreign Service Act of 1946, an act to improve, strengthen, and expand the Foreign Service of the United States, and to consolidate and revise the laws relating to its administration? We are all familiar at least with the general purposes of that legislation. I invite attention at this time to the following statement in the official bulletin from which I read a few moments ago, *The Foreign Service of the United States*, dated January 1, 1947. At page 6 this sentence appears:

In accordance with international practice the United States accredits diplomatic representatives to countries with which it maintains friendly relations. These representatives bear the title of Ambassador or Minister. In diplomatic language the Ambassador or Minister is termed to be on a mission,

and is therefore referred to as chief of mission. Ambassadors and Ministers are appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, some being career members of the Foreign Service and others appointed from private life. In January 1947—

This was only a few months after the passage of the act of 1946—

about 60 percent of the Ambassadors and Ministers were appointed from the career Foreign Service.

Mr. President, I have made some investigation as to what is the present situation in our diplomatic service, and I find that as of today, July 5, 1949, we have 13 Ministers—to Austria, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Lebanon, Nepal, New Zealand, Rumania, Switzerland, Syria, and Yemen. I find that of the 13 Ministers—and that is all we have at this time—all but one man, George A. Garrett, who is Minister to Ireland, and Robert M. Scotten, who is the Minister to New Zealand, are Foreign Service officers of the class of career minister. Mr. Scotten, one of the two men to whom I have referred, had been a career minister, and had retired as such on August 31, 1947. After a period of a few months he was appointed Minister to New Zealand on December 22, 1947. He served in the Foreign Service since 1916, except for the 4 months' period to which I have referred. Therefore, of the 13 Ministers we now have, to be joined by this fourteenth one, whoever he may be—only one of them had not been a career officer. Obviously the service of such men as Mr. Scotten and of others whose names are doubtless known to Members of the Senate would indicate something of their capacity.

Mr. President, I have referred to the question of qualifications. I have referred to the fact that the percentage of Ministers today who are career officers indicates the desirability and importance of their being well qualified. I have referred to the fact that the Congress itself, by the passage of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, indicated its own opinion to that effect.

Let me say something about Luxemburg. Someone may say, "Luxemburg is only a small place, no larger than some of the counties in the United States." That is true; and yet Luxemburg has had a most distinguished history. It occupies an important position in Europe. It is one of the Benelux countries, as we know. The Benelux countries are Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. The "lux" in the word "Benelux" is derived from Luxemburg. It is one of the signatories to the United Nations Charter. It is one of the 12 signatories to the Atlantic Charter, which we have been debating.

I have upon my desk this afternoon a bulletin issued from Luxemburg for February and April. It covers the period from February to April 1949. Members of the Senate will find it exceedingly interesting to read more of it than I shall this afternoon trespass upon the time of the Senate to read. Let me read merely a sentence or two, indicating the importance of Luxemburg in western Europe, as recognized by Great Britain. Great Britain has just had the privilege of designating a minister to Luxemburg, which

she did only a few months ago. We are about to designate a minister to Luxembourg. Previously Belgium had been the conduit through which our international diplomatic relations were handled with respect to Luxembourg. Our relations to and business with Luxembourg were in a sort of side-pocket of the Belgian Ministry. This is what the Luxembourg bulletin itself says:

Luxembourg's increasing importance in western Europe was reflected in the appointment in January of the first British Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary to the Grand Duchy.

That title is precisely the title—except for the reversal of the order of the words—of the office to which Mrs. Mesta has been appointed.

Continuing, the bulletin says:

The new Minister is Mr. G. C. Allchin; he entered the consular service in 1919—

I call attention to the fact that he is not a newcomer. He has been in the consular service for 30 years—

he entered the consular service in 1919 and became head of the Foreign Office Consular Department in 1943. Mr. Allchin is 53 and served with distinction in the First World War when he won the Military Cross. In 1947 he was promoted to be a Foreign Service officer.

So great Britain, close at hand to Luxembourg, knowing something first-hand about that country—perhaps something more than many of us may know—has realized the importance and the propriety of designating as its first Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary to the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg a man who has been in the Foreign Service for 30 years, having become head of the Foreign Service Consular Department in 1943.

Mr. President, I desire to take only a very few minutes further of the time of the Senate. I wish to call attention to what I consider to be an extremely important situation. Perhaps before mentioning that I should say a word or two further about Luxembourg. It has been the pleasure of some of us to know some of the representatives from Luxembourg. I want it distinctly understood, and I wish to make it perfectly clear, that nothing I have said today is in any sense derived from any representative of Luxembourg. So far as I know, no one connected with the diplomatic or any other service in Luxembourg, or any of its officers, had even the slightest intimation that I was about to make this presentation here today. The distinguished Minister, M. Gallais, and his wife have been most hospitable to my wife and myself in Washington. I know them and have a very high regard for them. But I wish to make it clear that they have nothing to do with what I am saying here today. This comes solely from myself.

It is true that Luxembourg is a small place. Yet Luxembourg is an important place. I shall not go into all the ramifications of its history. I shall not take time to develop what I might develop with respect to some of its industries. The iron and steel industry is the greatest industry of that particular community. I noted this morning in the World Almanac for this year a comment upon

the very large iron and steel industry of that country. It is strategically placed. It has interests in treaties such as the Aviation Treaty and the Intercommunications Treaty. As I have indicated, it is a member of various organizations such as Benelux and the United Nations, and it is one of the signers of the Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. As I understand the Senator's argument on this particular point, it is that it is important to send there someone who understands the business of Luxembourg. Otherwise there would be no occasion to refer to it. The Senator has emphasized the fact that the iron and steel business is the largest business there. I will ask the Senator to refer to the memorandum which he first mentioned and see what Mrs. Mesta's associations in business have been. As a matter of fact, when her husband died, he was the head of the great Mesta Machine Tool Co. of Pittsburgh. Mrs. Mesta undertook to manage it, and made a success of it. If there is any business about which she knows thoroughly, it is that very business. Does not the Senator regard that as a qualification for this particular appointment, in view of the emphasis he has placed upon the fact that the iron and steel business is the largest business of the country to which we are sending this Minister?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator has mentioned that; and I think her participation in that business, whatever it was, undoubtedly is an asset in her favor. How much of a participation she had in it I do not know. The Senator has indicated that she managed it.

Mr. GREEN. When her husband died, she undertook the management of it. If the Senator from Missouri will read the memorandum which he presented earlier, he will see that she is there registered as a director of it.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes. All the memorandum says on this subject is "former member of the board of the Mesta Machine Tool Co., Pittsburgh."

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not know whether she was the manager of it. She may have been; I do not know.

Mr. GREEN. The fact that she was a director of it is rather unusual for a woman, is it not?

Mr. DONNELL. I do not know. If a woman inherits the ownership of a company, I see nothing particularly unusual in her being placed on the board. She may have managed it; I do not know. However, not a word to that effect is stated in the memorandum.

Mr. GREEN. But she has made a great success of it.

Mr. DONNELL. She may have; I do not know whether she has done so or not.

Mr. GREEN. That is the trouble with the Senator's argument. He admits some things and asks questions about others.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I submit that the Senate is entitled to have

some information of an affirmative nature regarding appointees. I have found that no investigation was made by the Foreign Relations Committee, and thus far I have not developed on the floor of the Senate anything which to my mind justifies our voting for the lady who has been nominated.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I think that point was answered by me, when I drew attention to the fact that there was plenty of opportunity for inquiry after the President submitted the nomination. If the Senator from Missouri was in the Senate at that time, he must have heard it; or, if not, he must have read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The committee to which the nomination was referred waited a considerable time. There was plenty of opportunity for anyone who opposed the nomination to appear and ask questions. If questions had been asked, customarily the committee would appoint a subcommittee to investigate the matter and report the facts relative to it. But there was no suggestion from any source that there was any objection.

It is most unusual to try to conduct an investigation of such a matter on the floor of the Senate, as the Senator from Missouri has been doing today, and then to argue that the questions he asks now have not been answered, when they have not been asked before.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to close with these observations:

To my mind, it is important that the appointments to offices of this kind should not be made on either a political basis or a basis of friendship or a basis of the ability to extend hospitality. I do not think any one of those should be controlling.

The article in Time magazine is here, and any Senator who wishes to read it can do so. I do not wish to read all of it to the Senate. However, I should like to read a sentence or two from it. In the article Mrs. Mesta is spoken of rather familiarly, by the use of her first name, and then it is said that she—

admits that the duties of unofficial hostess to the President are heavy. "I have to know exactly what's on his mind and what he thinks of people all the time," she explains.

This purports to be quoted:

"I know, too. I don't have to call him and ask."

And so forth. I shall not go into that matter further.

But all the facts shown here do not, to my mind, demonstrate affirmatively that the nomination should be confirmed. I think we are entitled to have that demonstrated affirmatively by a committee which reports on the matter and recommends that we confirm this lady. Certainly I think we are entitled to have some basis of determining that the committee's recommendation is or is not well founded.

Mr. President, by the act of 1906, reform in the diplomatic service was sought; and today in the case of all 13 of

the ministers we have, there is only one who is not a career officer.

So I think it is unfortunate that at this time we take a step backward by having in a position of such importance as this one a person who is not affirmatively demonstrated to be the possessor of the appropriate qualifications.

Mr. Childs, in the book from which I have quoted, discusses at the outset the evolution of the Foreign Service. He says:

The first 40 years of the Republic are, somewhat sentimentally, called the Golden Age of American diplomacy.

I take it that those are the years from 1779 to 1819.

Then he says:

The next 90 years—

Until approximately 1909—

might, with equal propriety, be called the Dark Age.

Then he proceeds to elaborate somewhat on that. Then he says:

Representation abroad, being outside the focus of public attention, fell prey to the spoils system even more easily than did domestic offices. "In a nutshell," wrote Theodore Roosevelt, "the spoils or patronage theory, is that public office is primarily designed for partisan plunder. The diplomatic and consular posts abroad became, in effect, part of the sublegal machinery of election. They were awarded in repayment for campaign contributions and the delivery of blocks of votes. Under such circumstances, overseas representatives of integrity and ability—such as Consul Nathaniel Hawthorne, at Liverpool—were the rare exceptions.

The diplomatic posts—

I call attention to this, which I think is the concluding sentence from the quotation from Mr. Childs' book—

were usually given to generous contributors and powerful politicians who wanted to enhance their prestige and satisfy the social ambitions of their wives.

Mr. President, I do not think we should follow any plan which even remotely reverts to that condition.

I call attention to the Executive order of President Theodore Roosevelt of June 1906, which provided that appointments to the lower grades could be made only after examination. Promotion thereafter was to be made only on the basis of ability and efficiency in the executive service.

Mr. Childs says, in quoting the Executive order by President Theodore Roosevelt:

The spoils system of making appointments to and removal from office is so wholly and unmixedly evil; is so emphatically un-American and undemocratic, and is so potent a force for degradation in our public life, that it is difficult to believe that any intelligent man of ordinary decency who has looked into the subject can be its advocate.

As a matter of fact, the arguments in favor of the "merit system" and against the "spoils system" are not only convincing, but they are absolutely unanswerable.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that in my opinion in this case there is no evidence before the Senate which justifies an affirmative vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mrs. Mesta.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall vote for confirmation of the distinguished nominee, Mrs. Mesta, if you please, as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxemburg.

I look upon this as a gem of an appointment, for is not the lady a "Perle" in reality?

I point out that she is nominated to be Minister Plenipotentiary. To the Latin scholars of old the word "pleni" comes from "plenus," which means "full." Mrs. Mesta's life has been full of acts of hospitality and generosity, and she has been hostess at many banquets from which Senators have come very full of the good products of the fields and vineyards and of mirth and merriment.

Now there is some criticism of the nomination because the nominee has not come before the Foreign Relations Committee. She has not come before the committee, but the Senators have come before Perle Mesta, many and many a time, in these great feasts of the intellect and the palate, and many Senators have had ample opportunity to learn first hand of her qualities of mind and heart and her understanding of men and issues. And so I hope her nomination will be confirmed. I know there are in Luxemburg many men and women looking forward to the great day when she will arrive, to add her generosity, her largeness, and her hospitality, and to radiate the good influence she has radiated here in Washington. If there were 50,000,000 Frenchmen who could become the beneficiaries of her largeness and hospitality, I think I can hear the cry that would well up from the hearts of everyone there, who cry out in unison "C'est magnifique!"

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am surprised that the distinguished Senator from Missouri, with his usual candor and fairness, has failed to point out the splendid commendation of Mrs. Mesta the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] made here a few days ago.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I referred to that. I have it upon my desk. I referred to it.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator referred to it, but he did not state what the Senator from Maine had said in favor of this appointment. It seems to me that what the Senator from Maine said is important for us to consider in connection with this matter at this time, and I should like to call attention to his remarks. He pointed out in his remarks in the Senate:

That is the case of the recent nomination of Mrs. Mesta to represent this country in the Duchy of Luxemburg. Some question has been raised regarding her qualifications for that position. As a life-long advocate of the rights of women to participation in political affairs, it has been profoundly gratifying to me and, I know, to many on this side of the Chamber, to see the extent to which women are moving into the affairs of government and receiving some measure of recognition, however belated, to which they are entitled by the contribution which they can so obviously make. We have been delighted this year to welcome into our own ranks, on this side of the Chamber, a woman, a representative not merely of the State of Maine, but one who has also gained the confidence of the country in her short service in the Congress as a representative of

American womanhood; and it is a matter of profound gratification that on the other side of the aisle, in the administration, more and more women are coming to be recognized as capable of serving in more and more responsible positions.

It is for this reason, speaking not only because of my association with my colleague, but as one who for a great many years has advocated this further recognition, that I think the designation of Mrs. Mesta is one which may be very happily received. This is not a result of her social activities in Washington, which have been very generously referred to, but in my own experience I have had contacts with her in many of her charitable and church activities over a considerable period, so I think I speak with certain knowledge.

I spoke here some time ago regarding the nomination of Louis Johnson, who, it was alleged, was nominated primarily because he had raised Democratic campaign funds. I said I did not think that was any disqualification. I do not believe the fact that a man or a woman takes a keen interest in the activities of political parties and in the raising of political funds disqualifies him or her from participating in the Government. I wish to say about Mrs. Mesta what I said regarding Louis Johnson. As vice chairman of the campaign fund-raising committee I understand she did yeoman work, for which she was well qualified. I do not think that disqualifies her for other recognition.

I think it would be well for the society gossip columns of Washington to pause for a moment in the discussion of her talents as a hostess and point out perhaps some of the other activities of her distinguished career which I think are well worthy of attention. I would say that one qualification which should commend her as a Minister to Europe is that she is, I think, one of the few people in this country, men or women, who, having received a substantial fortune some 25 years ago, retains that fortune today. I think any woman or man who has demonstrated capacity to survive all the depressions of the past, and to be ready to go forward if we are to have a depression in the future, must have something besides the capacity to act as a gracious host or hostess. On that one consideration alone, I do not think America is likely to lose its shirt as a result of Mrs. Mesta representing us in Europe, and that I cannot say of all the diplomats we have sent abroad. I am glad we are sending that kind of a person abroad to represent us, someone who in her own right has demonstrated competence to care for the responsibility entrusted to her.

Moreover, Mrs. Mesta has also been conspicuous both in her charitable and church activities, demonstrating qualities which indicate that she will be neither a dipsomaniac nor senile, and that is more than we can say of many of those whom we have in the past entrusted with the responsibility of representing us abroad.

I fear that even in the present we could not boast of having an entirely clean slate. I shall not particularize, but I think it is appropriate to ask the defenders of masculine splendor and glory to contemplate a few of the representatives we have abroad wearing pants before they say too much about Mrs. Mesta and her capacity worthily to represent this country in the Duchy of Luxemburg at this time.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that that commendation by the distinguished Senator from Maine, who is chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee, should be very carefully considered at this time. It seems to me the Senator from Missouri is working in opposition to the chairman of the National

Republican Senatorial Committee. The Senator from Maine I think has covered the situation very clearly. He points out that this woman is really highly qualified for the position. I do not think that anything the Senator from Missouri has said has any contrary effect on me, and I am sure it has not, on any of the other Senators who have been listening to the debate today.

The Duchy of Luxemburg, as has been pointed out, is a small country. It has a population only about half that of the State of Montana. I do not understand that it is an industrial country. It has mines and farms. I am not trying to disparage the Duchy of Luxemburg; I am not trying to belittle it; but I do say this woman is highly qualified to represent our country in that state in Europe. I suggest that her nomination be confirmed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri made a number of references to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and its assumed, I suppose, negligence and indifference to this nomination. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that this nomination was investigated first, I assume, before it even went to the President, by the Department of State. Mrs. Mesta is quite a prominent figure. She is not unknown. I am sure she is not unknown to the Senator from Missouri. Then, the President himself, before sending the nomination to the Senate, investigated. From his knowledge, he already had rather comprehensive information about Mrs. Mesta. The biographical sketch which the Senator from Missouri presented showed that she had had experience in business. After the death of her husband, she was prominent in the affairs of the business in which he was largely interested, and whose resources apparently have been preserved even unto this time. Smooth slickers have not been able to induce her to give up her stocks and bonds because of rosy promises with respect to what lies over the hill in a greener land. She has still retained them.

Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations is a responsible committee. A number of distinguished Republicans are members of the committee. They are able. They are attentive to the affairs of the committee. They are regular in their attendance. They render the country very eminent service. No member of the Republican minority raised any objection to the confirmation. The Senator from Missouri was perfectly at liberty to consult those members before the nomination came up. With his ordinary zeal, he should have been able to find their offices. He should have been able to know where they sit in the Senate. He should have been able to get their telephone numbers from the book. If he had complaints against Mrs. Mesta, why did he not make them known to members of the committee, rather than wait until this late hour, to break forth in a great tirade against the lady, at the same time bragging about how he thinks women ought to have recognition in government.

The Senator from Missouri further complains that 14 out of 15 ministers in Europe, I believe he said, were career men. Career men are all right in their places, but I may say to the Senator that I do not favor having the whole Foreign Service of the United States dominated by career men. Career men enter the service as clerks, and keep stepping up and up, making a lifetime of it. Mr. President, they get into ruts. They often fall into the habit of treating matters in a purely routine manner. If one visits abroad, especially in peace time, and goes into the Embassies and the Consulates, he will observe that, wherever he goes, it is the same old story. There is a routine. The career man says, "I have to go. We have tea at 4 o'clock. I am sorry, but I must go to tea." They nearly all wear the same kind of clothes. They do the purely routine things over and over again. Their minds have little grooves in them, so that they repeatedly do the same things in the same way. I rather favor bringing some fresh air from the outside, some new strength, some strong men from industry, strong men who have distinguished themselves at the bar, businessmen, men from the school room, from colleges and universities, rather than simply placing the entire Foreign Service in charge of a few professionals who are in it for the profession's sake. They are in the service because they have a living there. They have been having a living, and they want to keep on living. I should like to see in the Foreign Service a few men who are there because they desire to render high service, because they want to contribute something to the peace of the world and to the welfare of the world, men with an enlarged view, men like Myron Taylor—

Mr. MURRAY. And like Andrew Mellon?

Mr. CONNALLY. Andrew Mellon was an ambassador for a short time only. John W. Davis is another able man. There have been great numbers of them in the past. I should rather have in our Foreign Service a few men of that kind than simply to call the roll of the many men who have been in the service ever since they could break out of college and go to the Foreign Service School here at Georgetown, subject themselves to an investigation, pass an examination, and get a commission. From then on they are on the pay roll for the rest of their lives. They have nothing to do except to read little bulletins from the Foreign Service School and to keep up on protocol, so that they will know when to say, "Do not go ahead. This man comes ahead of you. Do not do that."

That is the kind of person the Senator from Missouri would have dominating and controlling our Foreign Service.

Luxemburg is an important country. I had the pleasure of being there on one occasion. I do not like to differ with the Senator from Montana, but the country is somewhat industrialized. It has a steel and iron industry—

Mr. MURRAY. It is very small, however, and it is owned by the steel cartel of Germany.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is there. I do not care who owns it. It is in Luxem-

burg, and we have to deal with it through Luxemburg. Luxemburg is in the heart of Europe. How it has ever survived I do not understand, unless it has some clever diplomats and some smart rulers.

Let me say another thing to the Senator from Missouri. Luxemburg is what is called a Grand Duchy. Its ruler is a Grand Duchess, a female—a woman, if you please. Would it be so much out of harmony with the concept of women in government if we should send a minister to the Grand Duchess who was also a woman?

The Senator from Missouri wants a man with striped breeches, and a silk hat, perhaps. But, Mr. President, the record, so far as I know it, is that Mrs. Mesta is a woman of high character, and possesses a great deal of business experience, grace, and ability to get along with people. It is said that she entertains. That is what career men do, so she has at least that qualification. She will have contacts with diplomats of other nations, and with the Grand Duchess. It is no discredit to her that she meets people without offending them, that she can get along with them, and that she can extend hospitality.

So, Mr. President, that is all there is to the issue. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, by a unanimous vote of all Senators present—and there was a quorum—recommended confirmation. There was no objection by any Senator, Democrat or Republican, to the nomination of Mrs. Mesta. The Senator from Missouri was not present, or, if he was, he was under the table and we did not know he was there. He sent no message or note; he sent no telephone call; he asked no Republican or Democrat to oppose the nomination. Under those circumstances, it seems to me that the lady's nomination should be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mrs. Mesta as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxemburg? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President will be immediately notified of the confirmation.

There are additional nominations on the Executive Calendar, which will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harlan T. Chapman, of Ohio, to be Assistant Register of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry M. Durning, of New York, to be collector of customs in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That concludes the call of the Executive Calendar; and, without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

NOMINATION OF JESS LARSON TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments I report favorably the nomination of Jess Larson to be Administrator of General Services, and I ask unanimous consent for its consideration and confirmation. The nomination was ordered reported by the committee unanimously, and, if there be no objection, I should like to have the nomination confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, let me say that no one knows Jess Larson any better than I do. Is there any particular reason why the nomination should not be referred to the calendar, and be acted upon tomorrow?

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is no definite reason why it cannot be; but since there is no objection, I cannot see why, while we are in executive session, we should not confirm the nomination today.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not object if the Senator from Arkansas insists upon presenting the matter today, but I respectfully suggest that all nominations should run the regular course and should be presented for the consideration of the Senate after they have been on the calendar for 1 day. But if the Senator insists, I shall not object.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not like to insist. I shall regard the statement of the Senator from Nebraska as an objection and shall let the matter take its regular course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be placed on the calendar.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I understand that tomorrow the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] will address the Senate with reference to the North Atlantic Treaty. I do not know how long it will take or how long the Senate will be engaged in debate after the Senator finishes his address. But if we should finish at approximately 2 o'clock or 2:30 o'clock, and if there are no appropriation bills to be considered, we can proceed to the call of the calendar, beginning with Order No. 514. The calendar was last called on June 21, and a number of Senators have requested that I bring up the consideration of the calendar as soon as possible.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senate can proceed with the debate rapidly. The Senator from Michigan will address the Senate tomorrow for probably an hour and a half or 2 hours. By 2 o'clock the opponents of the treaty should begin to debate it. If they have anything to say against it, they should advance it. I think it is of the highest importance that when we begin we should go through to a conclusion. If we follow any other course we shall create the impression in other nations that we are indifferent about the matter. So I hope the Senator will postpone the call of the calendar at least for a day and give other Senators, who are in opposition to the treaty, an opportunity to show their hands.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator from Texas. I had hoped that some one or more of the Senators in opposition to the treaty might speak today and that the afternoon might have been concluded without the consideration of other business. However, in the event that no Senator desires to speak, tomorrow following the address of the able Senator from Michigan I should dislike very much to take a recess at 2:30 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. We can avoid that. All we have to do is to call the roll, and if Senators are not ready to speak, we can take a vote on the treaty. Give them a chance to be heard, but if they do not want to be heard, we can have a vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator from Texas that we should expedite the debate on the North Atlantic Treaty. That is the unfinished business before the Senate. On the other hand, it is a tremendously important matter. I am satisfied that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee does not mean that by tomorrow we should start to vote on the ratification of the treaty if some Senators are not ready to continue to debate the issue. I agree that we should expedite the treaty; but I feel that, after the distinguished Senator from Michigan has concluded his address, it would be in order, if the opponents are not ready to debate the issue, to carry it over until at least the next day in order to give them time not only to read the RECORD, but to digest what has been said by the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee. It is a big subject, and it certainly should be given the attention it deserves, and the roll should not be called because we have not anything else to do for the remainder of the afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nebraska refers to Senators having time to prepare. The treaty has been before the Committee on Foreign Relations for a long time, we had extensive hearings, and the hearings have all been printed. The committee made a full report, which has been published and placed on the desk of every Senator. We have been diligent in pushing the matter. We certainly should not be expected to wait indefinitely while a Senator is getting ready to debate the treaty.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield so that I may respond to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It is true that the Committee on Foreign Relations has had the treaty before it for months, but the Senate has had it under consideration 1 day, and tomorrow will be the second day. It is not unreasonable for the minority leader to suggest that Senators

have at least 1 day to prepare themselves to start debate in opposition. I am not an opponent, I am open minded. I want to be informed on the treaty, I want to hear the discussion not only of the opponents, but of the proponents.

I should like to ask the majority leader a question. In the event the distinguished majority leader finds it necessary to fill out the afternoon with a call of the calendar after the Senator from Michigan shall have concluded, is it the intention to start with Calendar No. 514?

Mr. LUCAS. It is my sincere hope that some Senator will be prepared to discuss the treaty, because that is the pending business, and I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Texas that we should do everything we can to expedite the debate on this extremely important measure. Those who oppose the treaty should try to be ready to debate the issue when the Senator from Michigan concludes. I was only attempting to make provision for a contingency which might arise in the event no Senators were ready to debate the treaty. If Senators are not prepared to discuss the treaty we will call the calendar starting with Order of Business No. 514.

Mr. WHERRY. The unanimous-consent request is that if the calendar is called, it will be called beginning at Order of Business 514?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No unanimous-consent request has been presented. The Senator from Illinois has been merely advising the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall make the request tomorrow. There are Senators who wish to discuss a couple of other bills on the calendar, and they can do that tomorrow. I doubt that objection will be made in the event a request is made to return to them if the consideration of the bills does not take too long. They are bills which have been objected to, but I understand the Senators who objected are withdrawing their objections. I have no objection to going back on the calendar to consider them, if they do not lead to too much debate, because the more measures we can remove from the calendar, the better progress we shall make.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to join with the distinguished majority leader, and with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in asserting that I, too, think we should expedite the pact as much as possible. I merely desired to indicate that I did not think any Senator should be cut off from debate, because we have had the pact before us for only 1 day. There will be no disposition on my part in any way whatsoever to delay the debate on the pact, or to have any other proposal made the temporary business of the Senate, setting the pact aside. But if those who are getting ready to debate the pact are not ready by tomorrow afternoon, I do not think there should be a roll call and they should be cut off from further debate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I did not mean to charge that there was a deliberate effort to postpone by Senators stating they were not ready, but there is always a disposition to put off until tomorrow what we do not want to do today. Sometimes one who is getting ready to

debate a subject will say, "I will wait until tomorrow. I may think of something in the meantime, I may have a dream, or see someone who will give me a point."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator knows that is not my feeling.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; but now that we have put our hands to the plow, we should go through with the debate without unnecessary delay. I plead with Senators to follow that course.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 6, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 5 (legislative day of June 2), 1949:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

John Halla

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of major for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Dorn E. Arnold

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Harvey W. Gagner

Albert N. Bailey

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Conrad J. Morgan

Robert J. Greenway

"J" "B" Powell

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Richard O. Ely

The following-named enlisted man for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Herbert E. McNabb

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 5 (legislative day of June 2), 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Mrs. Perle Mesta to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxemburg.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Harlan T. Chapman to be the Assistant Register of the Treasury.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Harry M. Durning to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 5, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon in the Ways and Means Committee room in the New House Office Building.

Rev. Robert Boggs, S. J., New Orleans, La., offered the following prayer:

Oh, God our Father, who watches over and guides the nations who seek Thy aid, grant help to us who begin our one hundred and seventy-fourth year of independence, that we may have that same trust in You that enlightened the founders of our Nation. May Your strong right hand guide this governing body, that they may decree what is good, legislate what is helpful for all, and execute according to Thy demands. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 1, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 30, 1949:

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of June C. Dollar;

H. R. 2989. An act to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3083. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3088. An act to increase the compensation of certain employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4754. An act to simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, to reorganize certain agencies of the Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5044. An act to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion in respect to tin and tin products conferred upon the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1949:

H. R. 5240. An act to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

On July 2, 1949:

H. R. 750. An act for the relief of Lee F. Bertuccioli;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of Sadae Aoki; and

H. R. 3458. An act for the relief of Celeste Iris Maeda.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

HON. PAUL BROWN

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce an anniversary today which I think will be of interest to every Member.

Sixteen years ago today Hon. PAUL BROWN was elected to this body as a Representative from the Tenth District of Georgia.

Since that day the gentleman from Georgia has not missed a single roll call, nor has he even been absent from a meeting of his committee. I think that is a record probably unequaled in the history of the House. The only day that he has not spent in the House when it was in session during the 16 years of his service here was the day of the funeral of his only son, Lt. Robert T. Brown, who gave his life in the Navy during the late war. The House is familiar with the character of the service PAUL BROWN has rendered.

There is no more conscientious, no more able Representative in this body, and I know you will rejoice with us Georgians on the anniversary of PAUL BROWN's service, and wish for him many more years of service here.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, 16 years is a long time to serve in any capacity in our country. It is a long time to serve in Congress and it certainly is a long time to serve in Congress and never have missed one single roll call. That is the record of our distinguished and able friend the Honorable PAUL BROWN.

The past 12 years I have served with PAUL BROWN on the Banking and Currency Committee, and all during the time he has been a member of that committee he has never missed a roll call of the committee. This is a very unusual record for a Member of Congress.

PAUL BROWN is one of the most conscientious men I have ever known. I do not know of anyone who goes to more trouble to find out exactly how to vote on a measure which will affect his people than he does. I suspect if his record were examined and compared with records of other Members of Congress, I doubt that anyone would have a record during the time that he has served here that is equal to this distinguished gentleman. Our Congress has been stronger during the time he has served and our Banking and Currency Committee has been stronger during the time he has served on that committee by reason of his service.

I express the hope that he will continue to render such fine and able service for many, many years to come. His constituents are very fortunate in having PAUL BROWN as their Congressman.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in one instance to include an address by Robert M. Hutchins, chancellor of the University of Chicago.